224 g 7

THE SCHOLAR ARMED

AGAINST THE

ERRORS OF THE TIME.

OR, A

COLLECTION OF TRACTS

ON THE

PRINCIPLES AND EVIDENCES OF CHRISTIANITY,

THE

CONSTITUTION OF THE CHURCH,

AND THE

AUTHORITY OF CIVIL GOVERNMENT.

IN TWO VOLUMES.

VOL. II.

THE WHOLE INTENDED FOR THE INFORMATION AND ASSISTANCE OF YOUNG STUDENTS IN OUR SCHOOLS AND UNIVERSITIES; AND PUBLISHED BY A

SOCIETY FOR THE REFORMATION OF PRINCIPLES.

LONDON:

PRINTED FOR F. AND C. RIVINGTON, N° 62, ST. PAUL'S CHURCH-YARD.

MDCCXCV.


G.R. III.

CONTENTS

OF

VOLUME II.

AN Eſſay on the Nature and Conſtitution of the Church of Chriſt - - - - Page 1

A Short View of the Argument between the Diſſenters and the Church of England - - - 55

Mr. Norris's *Account of Reaſon and Faith* - 79

A Preſervative againſt the Publications of modern Socinians 101

The Catholic Doctrine of the Trinity - - 131

A Letter to the Common People, anſwering the popular Argument againſt the Trinity - - 241

Reflexions on the Growth of Heatheniſm - - 265

Small PIECES *from the Poſthumous Papers of the late* Biſhop HORNE.

An Abridgment of the Aurifodina *of* Drexelius - 289

A Short Account of Biſhop Andrews - - 303

An Index to the Matter of Divinity - - 308

Directions for extracting and properly applying the Matter of a Text of Scripture - - - 311

On the Origin, Temper, Ill Effects, and Cure, of Enthuſiaſm - - - - - 314

On

CONTENTS.

On Schiſm, *according to the Scripture* - Page 326
Controverſy, *Directions for the Conduct of it* - 327
Voltaire *diſſected* - - - - 329
Evil-ſpeaking, *Hints to the Learned about it* - 340
Mr. Locke, *Conſiderations on his Scheme of an* original Compact - - - - 342
Biſhop Jeremy Taylor's *Moral Demonſtration of Chriſtianity* - - - - - 355
Leſlie's *Short Method with the Jews* - - 385

AN

ESSAY

ON THE

CHURCH.

PREFACE.

THE three great ſubjects with which a Chriſtian miniſter is concerned, are the word of God, the church of God, and the Chriſtian life. Circumſtances and occaſions will ſometimes direct his thoughts to one of theſe, and ſometimes to another: but ſo long as any of the three are before him, he is within the circle of his duty.

I WAS led to the ſubject of the following Eſſay, by an accident. I am a curate in a country pariſh; who make it my buſineſs, and have found it my pleaſure, to teach the children of my people privately in my own houſe, and publicly in the church; and I am, for the preſent, the only Sunday Schoolmaſter of the place. In the courſe of my inſtructions, I had occaſion to obſerve, that the catechiſm of the church of England, though a moſt excellent ſummary of the Chriſtian doctrine, is deficient in one point, viz. the conſtitution of the church of Chriſt; the knowledge of which, in a certain degree, is neceſſary to the preſervation of that charity which is the end of the commandment; and, for the want of which, ſo many are drawn away from the church, who would certainly have remained with it, if they had known what it is. Yet is our catechiſm not ſo deficient, but that it includes the grand diſtinction betwixt the world and the church; which diſtinction being explained, I found we were poſſeſſed of a leading

idea, which gave ſo much light to my young pupils, that I determined to go through the ſubject.

As I have been perſuaded, ever ſince I began to think on theſe things, of the great importance of uniformity in worſhip amongſt Chriſtians, ſo have I been led to obſerve, on the other hand, the many evil conſequences of non-conformity, with the dangerous deluſions of the mind, ariſing from the harangues of preachers pretending to extraordinary gifts, while they are but half learned in the Goſpel, which they undertake to publiſh, and are greatly miſtaken in the ſpirit of it. I ſee how ſome men are cheated with the appearance of being converted to godlineſs, when they are only converted from one ſin to another; from loving the world, to hating their neighbours; from the coldneſs of church devotion, to an uncharitable heat againſt the church itſelf; from the moral philoſophy of ſome of our pulpits, to the Antinomian faith, which gives men a licenſe to ſin; from the drunkenneſs of the body, to the intoxication of the mind, with ſpiritual pride and falſe doctrine.

I AM well aſſured that if this ſubject of the church, now ſo much neglected, and almoſt forgotten by thoſe who are moſt concerned to underſtand it, ſhould come to be better conſidered; there would be more true piety, and more peace, more of thoſe virtues which will be required in Heaven, and which muſt therefore be firſt learned upon earth.

SOME amongſt us err, becauſe they know not the Scriptures; and others, becauſe they never conſi-

dered

dered the nature of the church. Some think they can make their own religion, and ſo they deſpiſe the word of God, and fall into infidelity. Others think they can make their own church, or even be a church unto themſelves; and ſo they fall into the deluſions of enthuſiaſm, or the uncharitableneſs of ſchiſm. But, as there is nothing to enlighten the minds of men in the doctrines of ſalvation, but the word of God, ſo is there nothing that can unite their hearts and affections, but the church of God. "Ye are one bread, and one "body," ſaith the Apoſtle; one body by partaking of one bread; and that can only be in the ſame communion.

In the weighing of theſe things, the prevailing ſpirit of the times, and the ſanction which it may have given either to the profligate ſinner, or to the preſumptuous ſaint, are of no account upon the ſcale. In the ſettling of principles, we are never to conſider how the world hath practiſed, but how God hath taught. The practice of the multitude, how great ſoever that multitude may be, hath no influence upon truth: yet it will ſtagger the minds of many, and carry them away, as with an overbearing torrent. Happy are they who have a better rule to direct them. They know that man applauds, highly applauds, what God abominates: and the higher the applauſe, the more room there is for ſuſpicion. They know that the voice of the multitude was againſt Jeſus Chriſt, when but few were for him; and they had hid themſelves, and dared not to ſpeak their minds. When Noah followed the direction of God in building the ark,

for the ſaving of his houſe, the world was againſt him. To them no ark was neceſſary, becauſe they had determined amongſt themſelves that there would be no flood; and conſequently, that Noah was a bigot, whoſe undertaking, while it expoſed himſelf, was an invidious reflection upon the age. When the father of the faithful followed the calling of God, there were none to ſtand by him and encourage him; he was ſeparated from his neareſt relations; and whereſoever he went, he was under fears and dangers from people of a falſe perſuaſion. When Jeſus Chriſt brought with him from Heaven, that light which was to be the glory of his people, one ruler of the Jews came to him by ſtealth in the night, to conſult him as a teacher, come from God. So great was the authority of a blinded multitude, that a ruler of the people was afraid of being brought into diſgrace, by converſing perſonally with the Saviour of the world!

The times, therefore, and the people who live in them, are never to be conſidered by us, when we are ſeeking or following the truth, on the ground of its own proper evidence. When it was aſked, with a deſign to perplex the people, who, of the rulers, or of the phariſees, had believed? Our Saviour gave them a different rule: why do ye not of yourſelves, ſaid he, judge what is right; without going firſt to conſult thoſe who are blinded by falſe learning, and, with an appearance of great ſanctity, have impoſed upon the people? "See," ſaith one, "how faſt our doctrine is increaſing! all the learned are going after it; and you muſt all ſubmit to it in a very ſhort time." And who

are

are they that thus reaſon with us? The very ſame perſons who declaim ſo loudly on the fallibility of all men; and yet hold themſelves to be little leſs than infallible in the choice of their own opinions. Let error riſe as high as it can; and let truth ſink as low as a wicked world can reduce it; the difference betwixt them is the ſame as ever; and we ſhall ſtill find it wiſer and better to follow the ſetting ſun, as Columbus did when he diſcovered the Indies. The meteor of hereſy, which blazes and dazzles us for a while with its appearance, will burn out, and leave not a ſpark behind; while the ſun ſets to riſe again. Such will be the fate of the church, and of the doctrines of truth by which it is ſupported.

THERE never was a time from the beginning of the world, when there was not a party againſt the church of God: and our Iſrael muſt have its enemies, as that church had which came out of Egypt. In the firſt age of the Goſpel, the Apoſtle St. Jude ſpoke experimentally of thoſe whom he then ſaw, or prophetically of thoſe whom we ſhould ſee, that they go in the way of Cain, and run after the error of Balaam, and periſh in the gainſaying of Corah. If our governors were as cruel as Pharaoh, ſome would rejoice at it, and upbraid us with every diſadvantage we might be under from hard uſage; as a ſign that the church is a thing of no conſequence, and that all thoſe who belong to it are the vaſſals of the ſtate. If the church were as pure as Abel, the envy and jealouſy of Cain would hate its offerings and ſacrifices. If its order and œconomy were as perfect as in that church

which covered the face of the earth in its paſſage to Canaan, the ſelf-intereſted ſpirit of the mercenary Balaam would endeavour to bring a curſe upon it, and blaſt its greatneſs. If its governors were as manifeſtly ſupported in their commiſſion as Moſes and Aaron, the ſpiritual pride of Corah would ſet up the holineſs of the congregation againſt its prieſthood, and the power of the people againſt the civil magiſtrate, who gives it protection. But none of theſe things ought to ſtagger or ſurprize a reader of the Scripture: they are all to be expected: theſe things were our examples; and the church would not be the church of God, if there were none to riſe up againſt it.

With theſe conſiderations in his mind, and not without them, a reader will be prepared to examine what I have written upon the church. If any of our diſſenting brethren ſhould look into this little piece, and find the matter ſo repreſented as to engage their attention; my prayer ſhall be with them, that God may give them the grace to caſt out the bitter leaven of a party-ſpirit; to lay aſide all temporal motives and intereſts, and conſider the church (as I have done) only ſo far as it is related to the other world. To any particular or national church, all temporal alliances are but momentary conſiderations, which paſs away with the faſhion of this world; and the church may be either with them, or without them, as it was in the firſt ages: for the church itſelf, under the relation it bears to Jeſus Chriſt, abideth for ever.

ESSAY

ESSAY

ON THE

CHURCH.

CHAP. I.

OF THE DISTINCTION BETWEEN THE WORLD AND THE CHURCH; WITH THE NATURE AND CHARACTER OF BOTH SOCIETIES.

TWO things of a contrary nature are beſt underſtood when they are placed near to one another, or compared together in the mind. The ſummer is better underſtood, and more to be valued, when we compare it with the winter; a ſeaſon in which ſo many comforts are wanting, which the ſummer affords us. The bleſſings of government are more acceptable, when compared with the miſeries of anarchy. We have the like advantage when we compare together the *church* and the *world*, thoſe two ſocieties of which we are members: of the world by our natural birth; of the church by our ſpiritual birth in baptiſm. When we are admitted into the Chriſtian covenant, we renounce this world as a wicked world, and become members of the church, which is called the holy church. Both theſe

ſocieties are influential on thoſe who belong to them; the one corrupts, the other ſanctifies: therefore it is of the laſt importance to mankind to conſider and underſtand the difference between them.

If we aſk, why the world is called wicked, we ſhall find it to be ſuch from the nature and manners of its inhabitants: for the world, as it means the ſyſtem of the viſible creation, can have no harm in it. There can be no wickedneſs, where there is no moral agency nor freedom of action.

From the ſin of Adam, and the effects of his fall, the ſtate of man by nature is a ſtate of ſin. The Scripture is ſo expreſs in this, that it is not neceſſary to inſiſt upon it. A diſpoſition to evil comes into the world with every man, and is as a ſeed, which brings forth its fruit throughout the courſe of his life. Many evil paſſions diſturb and agitate his mind; and from the ignorance or darkneſs which prevails in him, he knows not that he is to reſiſt them in order to his peace and happineſs; nor hath he ability ſo to do, if he did know it. The worſt and the moſt violent of all his paſſions is pride, which affects ſuperiority, and delights in vain ſhew, and pompous diſtinction; whether it be that of wealth, or honour, or wiſdom. Covetouſneſs diſpoſes him to take all he can to himſelf, and pay no regard to the wants of others; whence the ſtate of nature is a ſtate of war, in which men plunder and deſtroy one another; not knowing the way of peace, which conſiſts only with reſtraint, and muſt be taught them from above; "the way of "peace have they not known," ſaith the Scripture.

Man knows all things by education, but nothing by nature, except, as the Apoſtle ſaith, what "he knoweth na-"turally as a brute beaſt." The world, as we ſee it now, is under the reſtraint of laws, which in ſome countries are better in themſelves, and better executed than in others: but if there were no laws and no governments to execute them, then we ſhould ſee what a ſcene of deſtruction and miſery this world would be, through the ſinfulneſs of man's nature. Fraud, rapine, and cruelty, thoſe three dreadful monſters, make

make ſtrange havock amongſt us, notwithſtanding the laws and regulations of ſociety: what then would this world be without them?

With reſpect to God, the ſtate of man is a ſtate of rebellion, alienation, and condemnation. His ways are ſo oppoſite to the will of God, that he is ſaid to be at enmity with him. He has no alliance with his Maker, either as a child, a ſubject, or a ſervant; but being under a general law of diſobedience, can inherit nothing from God but wrath and puniſhment.

You will ſee this account verified by the plaineſt declarations of the Scripture.—Firſt, as to the enmity of the world againſt God. "If the world hate you," ſaith our Lord when he came to ſave it, "ye know that it hated me before "it hated you." Secondly, as to their alienation or departure from all alliance with him—"you that were ſome "time alienated and enemies in your minds by wicked "works;" ſaith St. Paul, Col. i. 21: and again, ſpeaking of the natural ſtate of the Epheſians before their converſion, he deſcribes them as "aliens and ſtrangers from the cove-"nants of promiſe, having no hope, and without God in "the world." In which paſſage, there is ſomething farther than appears from the ſound of the words; for when we read, "without God in the world," the words "in the world," are emphatical, and denote this wicked world, ſuch as we have been deſcribing it, of which they that are members, muſt of courſe be without God, and without hope: they belong to a ſociety which knows him not.

Then, thirdly, that the world is under condemnation; "we are chaſtened of the Lord," ſaith St. Paul, "that we "ſhould not be condemned with the world:" whence it is evident, that the world, as ſuch, is under condemnation, and can expect nothing of God but puniſhment for ſin.

We are now prepared to take a review of this ſociety called the world. It is compoſed of men loſt by the fall; diſpoſed to all manner of evil; ignorant of the way of peace; at enmity with God, and with one another; delighting themſelves in the pride of appearance, and the vanity

vanity of diſtinction. In a word, "the whole world lieth "in wickedneſs," and they that are condemned for ſin, will be condemned with the world, whoſe condemnation, therefore, is a thing of courſe. What human philoſophy may ſay of this deſcription of the world, we are not to regard: if it is the deſcription which ſtands in the Holy Scripture, we are not to conſider what men may ſay of it. A proud world will never be pleaſed to ſee an humiliating deſcription of itſelf.

Such then is the world, and ſuch are we all, ſo far as we are members of it. God therefore of his infinite mercy takes us out of this wicked ſociety, and tranſlates us into another. He "delivers us from the power of darkneſs, "and tranſlates us into the kingdom of his dear Son;" and without this tranſlation we are inevitably loſt. You are here to obſerve, that the kingdom of Chriſt is one of the names of his church; and they that are in it, as it is diſtinguiſhed from the world, are called "children of the "kingdom." Its nature is totally different from the kingdoms of this world (of which we ſhall ſee more hereafter;) for as the world is called wicked, ſo the church is called holy; and all the holineſs that can be in man, muſt be derived from thence. If we enquire how, and in what reſpects, the church is holy, we find it muſt be ſo from its relation to God. It is called the "church of God;" and he being holy, every thing that belongs to him muſt be ſo of courſe. And further, it is a ſociety, or body, of which the Holy Spirit is the life; and this life being communicated to thoſe who are taken into the church, they are thereby made partakers of an holy life, which is elſewhere called "the life of God;" from which life they are alienated who are out of this ſociety. It is holy in its ſacraments; our baptiſm is an holy baptiſm, from the holy ſpirit of God; the Lord's ſupper is an holy ſacrifice; the ordinance of abſolution is for the forgiveneſs of paſt ſin, that the members of the church may be recovered from ſin to a ſtate of holineſs, and peace with God. The church is holy

in

in its prieſthood; all the offices of which are for the ſanctification of the people.

The contrary nature of the two ſocieties I have been ſpeaking of, will now be better underſtood, when they are compared together. In the one, men are in a loſt condition; in the other, they are in a ſtate of ſalvation: for as the world is alienated from God, the church is in alliance and covenant with him, and partaker of his promiſes. As the world is under condemnation, the church is under grace and pardon of ſin: its baptiſm waſhes away original ſin, and gives a new birth to purity and righteouſneſs; its other ſacrament of the Lord's ſupper maintains that ſpiritual life which is begun at baptiſm, as meat and drink ſupport the life we receive at our natural birth. As the world is without hope, the Chriſtian hath hope in death, through the reſurrection of Chriſt, and is aſſured, that he who is united to the life of God, can never die: for God is not the God of the dead, but of the living. While the wicked are to periſh with the world which they inhabit, the children of God are "heirs with Chriſt of an eternal kingdom."

The church is alſo holy, when by the word church, we underſtand the building or place in which the people aſſemble to accompliſh the ſervice of God. As the world, on the other hand, hath always had its unholy places of aſſembly, its theatres, its idol temples, &c. which unſanctify and pollute thoſe who frequent them. Under the Jewiſh ſtate of the church, the temple is called the "holy temple," or "holy "place;" (Heb.) and a part of it was called the "moſt "holy place." Our Saviour allows that the temple ſanctified the gold, which was offered in it, and conſequently all other offerings and ſacrifices there made. Now, if that temple was holy, whoſe glory was to be done away; certainly the place of Chriſtian worſhip, called the church, muſt be holy alſo. For why was the temple at Jeruſalem holy, but becauſe the preſence of God attended it? And has he not promiſed to be in the midſt of us? And muſt not our churches therefore be holy upon the ſame account? And are not they guilty of a great ſin, who treat any church with

with irreverence? Much more if they deſpiſe or defile it? For it is ſaid, "he that defileth the temple of God, him "ſhall God deſtroy."

But nothing will ſhew us the difference between the world and the church ſo effectually, as when we conſider who is at the head of each ſociety. Chriſt is the head of the church, and the devil is the prince of this world, who is alſo called the "god of this world." They who are in the church, are in the kingdom of Chriſt; which, though not *of* this world, as not deriving its power from thence, is yet *in* this world. They who are of this world, are in the kingdom of Satan, and under his power; as the heathens are ſaid to have been before they were redeemed from it, and brought over to the kingdom of God: which tranſlation was ſignified by the redemption of the Hebrews, from under the power of Pharaoh.

If we enquire into the reſpective characters of the head of the church, and the prince of this world, as they are deſcribed under a variety of names, the oppoſition is wonderful; and it will be found very inſtructive, becauſe there is the ſame oppoſition betwixt the children of each.

The head of the church is called Jeſus the Saviour: the head of this world is a deſtroyer; in Hebrew, Abaddon; in Greek, Apollyon.

The one is the true light; that is, a ſpiritual light to the ſoul of man; the other is the prince of darkneſs.

The one is a ſhepherd, gathering the lambs with his arm, and feeding his flock; the other is a lion who goeth to and fro in the earth, ſeeking whom he may devour.

The one is a lamb; meek, innocent, and ſpotleſs: the other is a ſerpent; deceitful, ſubtile, and with poiſon under his lips.

The one is the phyſician of ſouls, who went about healing the ſick, and raiſing the dead: the other is the inflicter of diſeaſes, bowing men down with infirmities; binding them with the bonds of affliction; and was a murderer from the beginning; for he brought death into the world by the temptation of man in paradiſe. Men murder individuals; but

but Satan murders a whole world at once; and is the prince of murderers.

The one delivers men who are under temptation to ſin; the other is the tempter, who leads them into it. And as the one is the advocate of ſinners, interceding for them as their prieſt and mediator, the other is the grand accuſer, who is therefore called the devil, which ſignifies an accuſer.

And laſtly, (for I think we need go no farther at preſent) the one is the truth, the other is a lyar, and the father of lies.

The like difference is found in the children of this world, and the children of the kingdom of God; that is, between the wicked world, who are under the power of Satan, and the holy church, which is the flock of Chriſt, and takes him for its pattern. It cannot be otherwiſe; the ſpirit of the head muſt be diffuſed through the members; and you will ſee it to be true: firſt, with reſpect to the holy church of Chriſt; whoſe diſciples are taught to relieve one another in their wants, and ſave one another in their diſtreſs; rejoicing and ſuffering together, as the members of the ſame body; and doing good unto all men. His miniſters are ſhepherds; his followers, from the firſt ages of Chriſtianity, were accounted and treated as ſheep for the ſlaughter, and were patient and unreſiſting. They exhort and encourage one another to good works; and being united together under a bond of peace, their charity covereth a multitude of ſins; that is, it hideth and concealeth the many failings of their brethren for the love of Chriſt, inſtead of aggravating their offences, and judging them unmerciſully. They are children of light, who derive the light of wiſdom from the word of God; and walk openly and honeſtly, as in the day. In their converſation they are true and faithful, and give you a direct anſwer, without diſguiſe or ſubterfuge.

Such ought to be the members of the holy church of Chriſt: this is the character intended for them, though many fall ſhort of it, and ſome totally depart from it. But the viſible church membership of men does not depend upon

their manners and opinions, nor indeed upon any thing they can do for themſelves; becauſe it is the gift of God, by his miniſters; ſo that a man in a holy church may be an unholy man: for the kingdom of heaven, or church of Chriſt, is like a net caſt into the ſea, which gathers of every kind, both bad and good; and an effectual ſeparation is never made between them, till the angels drag this net to the ſhore, to gather the good into veſſels, and caſt the bad away. If we bear this caſe in mind, it will deliver us from a great deal of perplexity. It is truly a ſorrowful fact, that the children of God, in too many inſtances, depart from their proper character: but the character proper to the world is, in all reſpects, like that of Satan, wicked and miſerable.

As the devil is the prince of this world, his children ſet their affections upon it; and it is the main purpoſe of their lives to obtain and enjoy it at any rate. For this they ſell their ſouls, and if they get the world in exchange, they think they are gainers by the bargain.

As he is the prince of darkneſs, ſo do they fall into ignorance, and blindneſs of heart, and love darkneſs rather than light, that their deeds may not be reproved. They hate the word of God, as owls and bats hate the day-light; and diſpute fiercely for their errors, leſt information and conviction ſhould bring them to repentance.

As the devil is a deſtroyer, ſo do the children of this world deſtroy one another. Their wiſe politics produce war and deſolation; their error and deluſion of mind ſtir them up to the perſecution of the ſervants of God: and wherever we ſee oppreſſion, and cruelty, and perſecution, there we ſee the ſpirit of the devil, the father of perſecution, who, by violence, will terrify and compel, where he cannot perſuade.

As he is a ſerpent, ſo his children are a generation of vipers, double-tongued and deceitful; ſmooth and flattering on ſome occaſions, but waiting to give a deadly bite when they are offended and provoked. Their way is crooked and uncertain, like the path of a ſerpent. An honeſt man, whoſe

whoſe path is direct and plain, can never tell what to make of them, becauſe they pretend to be going one way, while they are going another; and they often gain their end by it, as the twiſtings of the ſerpent carry him to the point he aims at.

As Lucifer fell from heaven for rebellion, all his children are impatient under authority; and in this capacity they are called ſons of Belial; which means, that they can bear no ſuperior. Patience, and obedience, and ſubmiſſion, are eſſential to the Chriſtian character. Chriſt himſelf is our pattern, who allowed that the power of Pilate, ſo unjuſtly exerciſed, was given him from above, and ſubmitted to his ſentence, when he could have ſtruck him dead upon his bench. But reſiſtance is the devil's doctrine, and the world's practice. The Goſpel teaches us, that the things which are highly eſteemed among men, are an abomination in the ſight of God, and here we ſee it verified; nothing is more deteſtable to the God of peace, than the ſin of rebellion; and nothing is more magnified and applauded by the children of this world; who have ſet what they call the power of the people, above the power of God almighty. He ordains government, and kings are his miniſters; but the people are told, that they have power to overthrow his ordinance, and judge his vicegerents*.

As the devil is a tempter, his children act under him in that capacity: moſt wicked men have a ſtrange deſire to make all others as wicked as themſelves. The world is full of ſeducers, who tempt men to falſe principles, and immorality of life. Some get their livelihood by the corruption of other people; and moſt infidels and heretics are ſo diligent in ſpreading their opinions, that if the friends of truth were equally zealous, the world would not be able to ſtand againſt them.

As the devil is the grand accuſer, ſo doth the world delight itſelf in evil-ſpeaking. Railing and ſlandering is their

* From ſeveral paſſages in this treatiſe, the reader may ſuſpect that the revolution in France is alluded to; but it was in print two years before that event.

great amuſement. Evil words are not pointed againſt evil things. The world delights to aſperſe thoſe who are unlike to themſelves. There never was a good man, nor ever will be, who was not evil ſpoken of, and depreciated in the judgment of the public; and the rule is ſo univerſal, that our Saviour ſaith to all Chriſtians, "Woe be unto you, when "all men ſpeak well of you." Falſe prophets were well ſpoken of by the people; and there muſt be ſomething falſe and ſpurious, ſome "evil with the appearance of good*," in every popular character that pleaſes the world.

As the devil is the father of lies, ſo all they that are of the devil are liars, who will never make a ſcruple of a lie to hurt others, or ſerve themſelves. The whole Heathen religion was one great lie, in oppoſition to the truth of the divine law. Much evil is threatened to thoſe who put evil for good, and good for evil; who make the heart of the righteous ſad, by predicting evil to them, and by promiſing happineſs and proſperity to the wicked. Thus did they ſpeak of old, who were called falſe prophets; and it would be happy for us, if there were none of them amongſt us: but, wherever they are found, they are the miniſters of Satan: and how fair and fine ſoever they may ſpeak on ſome occaſions, it is no proof of their goodneſs; for Satan is ſometimes, as it ſerves his purpoſe, transformed into an angel of light, and affects an holy and heavenly character; and then he is moſt a devil, becauſe he can moſt deceive.

* Καλον κακον αντ' αγαθοιο.

HESIOD.

CHAP.

CHAP. II.

OF THE MEANS OF GRACE, AND THE MARKS BY WHICH THE CHURCH OF CHRIST IS TO BE KNOWN.

HAVING explained the nature of theſe two ſocieties, the holy church, and the wicked world, we muſt conſider the uſe of the church, and the marks by which it is to be known. It is promiſed, "that he who believeth, and "is baptized, ſhall be ſaved." But how ſhall we have this baptiſm, unleſs we have it from thoſe whom God hath appointed to baptize? It is alſo promiſed, "he that eateth "my fleſh, and drinketh my blood, hath eternal life:" and how ſhall we receive the body and blood of Chriſt, but from the church, to whom he ſaid, when he inſtituted the Lord's ſupper, "Do this in remembrance of me." This being the commemorative ſacrifice of the New Teſtament, it can be offered only by a prieſt; and all the world cannot make a prieſt. The miniſters of the Old Teſtament were ordained to their office by an immediate commiſſion from God to Moſes, the mediator of that time betwixt God and the people. The miniſters of the New Teſtament were ordained by Chriſt himſelf; from whom the authority deſcended to others, and ſhall reach, through a variety of hands, to the end of the world.

This is the way God hath been pleaſed to take to make men holy, and bring them to himſelf, through this dangerous world, as he brought Noah and his family out of the old world into the new, by means of an ark, which was a figure of his church. It is therefore of infinite conſequence that we ſhould be able to know, with certainty, whether we are in the church, or out of it. If we are out of it, we are in the world. If we had been out of the ark, we ſhould have been drowned. It is true, we may be in the church, and yet be loſt; for was not Ham in the ark, who was a reprobate? But if we are out of the church, how can we be ſaved?

I would not, for the whole world, unworthy as I am; I ſay I would not, for the whole world, and all the kingdoms of it, be in doubt whether I was tranſlated, or not, into the kingdom of Jeſus Chriſt. I would not be in doubt, whether I have the ſacraments, or whether I have them not. But how can I be ſure in this caſe, unleſs I know what the kingdom of Chriſt is; where it is to be found; and what are the marks by which it may be known? Many ſtrange abuſes in religion have ariſen on occaſion, and under the ſpecious name of reformation; a very good word; but it hath been applied to a great many bad things, even to madneſs and blaſphemy. We are fallen into times when ſome ſay, "lo, here is Chriſt," or, "lo, there;" in the "deſert," or in the "ſecret chambers;" and are bid to take heed that no man deceive us. What a terrible caſe ſhould we be in, if we had no ſufficient warnings given to us, and no rule to go by! But as the lightning which cometh from the eaſt ſhineth unto the weſt, ſo plain and notorious was the eſtabliſhment of Chriſt's kingdom in this world, together with the form of its conſtitution, and the orders of its miniſtry, in all the countries wherever it was planted. It would be unreaſonable: indeed it would be lamentable; it would ſeem as if God had mocked us, contrary to the nature of his mercy, that he ſhould publiſh a way of ſalvation, and leave it uncertain where it is to be found.

From what is ſaid of it in the Goſpel, it is impoſſible that the church ſhould be a ſociety obſcure and hard to be diſtinguiſhed. "Ye are the light of the world," ſaid Chriſt to his diſciples; "a city that is ſet on a hill cannot be hid." Light is ſure to ſhew itſelf; and it comes in ſtrait lines, which direct us to its ſource. A city placed upon a mountain is ſo elevated above other objects, that it cannot be difficult to find it; rather, it is impoſſible to miſs it; it can- "not be hid:" and Chriſtian people in all ages ſeem to have agreed, that it ſhall not be hid: for when we approach a city in any part of Chriſtendom, the churches are generally firſt ſeen towering over all other buildings.

Chriſt hath given us a precept, that, under certain circumſtances, we ſhould tell our caſe to the church: but unleſs it be known what and where the church is, this cannot be done. The precept therefore ſuppoſes, that the church muſt be known to us. The ſame muſt follow from the injunction of St. Paul, in his epiſtle to the Hebrews.—"Obey them that have the rule over you, and ſubmit your-"ſelves: for they watch for your ſouls, as they that muſt "give account." Chap. xiii. 17. The rulers of the church muſt therefore be known to us; for it is impoſſible we ſhould do our duty, and ſubmit ourſelves to them, unleſs we are ſure who they are.

The church then muſt, in its nature, be a ſociety manifeſt to all men. Some may ſlight it, and deſpiſe it, and refuſe to hear it; but they cannot do even this, unleſs they know where it is to be found.

When we enquire more particularly what the church is, it may be beſt to proceed as we are obliged to do in ſome other caſes; firſt, to learn what it is not; that we may go upon right ground, and underſtand with more certainty what it is.

The church then, as a ſociety, is not the work of man; nor can it poſſibly be ſo. I have laid the foundation of all my reaſonings upon this ſubject, in the diſtinction betwixt the church and the world, as two ſeparate parties. The church is ſo named *, becauſe it is called or choſen out of the world. 'Till it is ſo called out of the world, it hath no being: but it cannot call itſelf, any more than a man can bring himſelf into the world.

Our Chriſtian calling is as truly the work of God, and as much independent of ourſelves as our natural birth. The church muſt have orders in it for the work of the miniſtry: but no man can ordain himſelf, neither can he (of himſelf) ordain another, becauſe no man can give what he hath not. "How ſhall they preach," ſaith the Scripture, "unleſs "they be ſent?" And again, "no man taketh this honor "to himſelf, but he that is called of God, as was Aaron."

* In Greek Εκκλησια.

Nay, even "Chriſt glorified not himſelf to be made an "High Prieſt, but he that ſaid unto him, thou art my ſon, "this day have I begotten thee." The church muſt have promiſes; without which, it can have no reaſon or encouragement to act: but no man can give it thoſe promiſes; which are "exceeding great and precious." The church muſt have power, without which it can do nothing to any effect: but there is "no power but of God." It muſt have power to forgive ſins; the forgiveneſs of ſins in the holy catholic church, being an article of the Apoſtles creed: but "who can forgive ſins, but God only?" It muſt act in the name of God, or not at all; becauſe it acts for the ſalvation of man: but no man can act in the name of God, but by God's appointment. No ambaſſador ever ſent himſelf, or took upon him to ſign and ſeal treaties and covenants (ſuch as the ſacraments of the church are) without being ſent; that is, without receiving authority ſo to do, from an higher power. The act would be ſo far from beneficial, that it would be treaſonable. If an army were to raiſe itſelf without commiſſions, what would ſuch an army be, but a company of banditti, leagued together to plunder and deſtroy the honeſt ſubjects of an eſtabliſhed community?

Nothing therefore is plainer, on theſe conſiderations, than that the church neither is, nor can be from man. It is no human inſtitution; and as it acts under God, if it acts at all, it muſt act by his authority and appointment. It is properly called, the church of God, (of the living God, in oppoſition to the profane ſocieties, ſelf-erected for the worſhip of dead idols) and mankind might as reaſonably preſume to make God's world, as to make God's church.

Farther enquiry will ſhew us, that the church is no confuſed multitude of people, independent of one another, and ſubject to no common rules; but a regular ſociety, like to other ſocieties, in ſome reſpects, and unlike them all in others. It is called a body, a family, a city, a kingdom. A body is a regular ſtructure, the limbs of which being joined together, are ſubordinate and ſubſervient to one another, and are animated by the ſame ſoul or ſpirit.

So

So ſaith the Apoſtle, "for by one ſpirit we are all baptized "into one body." 1 Cor. xii. 13. It being alſo called a family, the members of it muſt have ſome common relation to one another: being called a city, it muſt be incorporated under ſome common laws; and being a kingdom, it muſt have ſome form of government and magiſtracy. Families, cities, and kingdoms, are ſocieties; and the church, being repreſented by them, muſt be a regular ſociety. But in this the church differs from all other ſocieties, becauſe they belong to this world, and their rights and privileges are confined to it: whereas the church extends to both worlds, the viſible and the inviſible, and is partly on earth, and partly in heaven. In its earthly members it is viſible; in its rulers, it is viſible; in its worſhip, it is viſible; in its ſacraments, it is viſible. But being alſo a ſpiritual ſociety, it hath a life which is hidden, and in the inward and ſpiritual grace of all its outward ordinances, it is inviſible. As a kingdom in which God is Judge, and Chriſt is a Mediator, and angels and ſaints departed, are members, it takes in the heaven itſelf, and is the "heavenly Jeruſalem," which is the "mother of us all;" inſomuch, that when we are admitted into it, our "converſation * is in heaven," and the angels of heaven are our fellow-ſervants; all making one great family under Jeſus Chriſt, in whom "all things are gathered "together in one, both which are in heaven, and which "are on earth:" on which conſideration, what is rightly done in the church on earth, ſtands good in heaven, as if it had been done there; and the Apoſtles of Chriſt received from him, the "keys of the kingdom of heaven," with a power of binding and looſing, which extends to heaven itſelf: and when Chriſtians go to heaven, they are not carried into a new ſociety, for they are already, by the grace of God, tranſlated into it by baptiſm; whence the Apoſtle ſpeaks of their tranſlation, not as a thing expected, but even now brought to paſs. He "hath tranſlated us," &c. Col. i. 13.

* Gr: πολίτευμα, our citizenſhip.

The church doth alſo differ from other ſocieties, in that it is catholic or univerſal; it extends to all places, and all times, and is not confined to the people of any nation, or condition of life, but takes in Jews, Greeks, and Barbarians, the rich and the poor, the bond and the free; and is therefore properly ſignified in one of our Saviour's parables by an inn, where all that offer themſelves are accepted. The commiſſion of Chriſt to his Apoſtles, was to "teach and "baptize all nations."

The church being a kingdom, not of this world, is of a ſpiritual nature, and in that capacity it is inviſible; but as a kingdom in this world, it is viſible, and muſt have a viſible adminiſtration. To know what this is, and whence its authority is derived, we muſt go back to the Goſpel itſelf.

Jeſus Chriſt was ſent from heaven by the Father, and inveſted with the glory of the Prieſthood by an actual conſecration, when the ſpirit deſcended upon him. As the Father ſent him, "ſo did he ſend his diſciples," and gave them authority to ſend others: ſo that the church which followed, derived its authority from the church which Chriſt firſt planted in the world; and the church at this day muſt derive its authority after the ſame manner, by ſucceſſion from the church which went before; the line extending from Chriſt himſelf, to the end of the world: "lo," ſaid he, "I am with you always, unto the end of "the world:" certainly, not with thoſe very perſons, who all ſoon died, but with thoſe who ſhould ſucceed, and be accounted for the ſame; for a body corporate never dies, till its ſucceſſion is extinct *.

Our Saviour at firſt ordained his twelve Apoſtles according to the number of the tribes of the church of Iſrael. After-

* "Take away this ſucceſſion, and the clergy may as well be ordained by one perſon as another: a number of women may as well give them a divine commiſſion;—but they are no more prieſts of God, than thoſe who pretend to make them ſo. If we had loſt the Scriptures, it would be very well to make as good books as we could, and come as near them as poſſible: but then it would not only be folly, but preſumption, to call them the word of God." See the ſecond Letter to the Biſhop of Bangor: Poſtſcript.

wards

wards he ordained other ſeventy, according to the number of the elders, whom Moſes appointed as his aſſiſtants. When the church in Jeruſalem was multiplied, ſeven deacons were ordained, by the laying on of the hands of the Apoſtles, to preach, and baptize, and miniſter, in diſtributing the alms of the church. Here then we have three orders of men, each diſtinct from the other; the twelve Apoſtles, the ſeventy diſciples, and the ſeven deacons; and by theſe the firſt Chriſtian church in Jeruſalem was governed and adminiſtered. The Apoſtles were ſuperior in office to the diſciples; becauſe, when Judas fell from the apoſtleſhip, one was choſen by lot out of the diſciples into the apoſtleſhip: the deacons were inferior to both; and it appears that they were appointed by the laying on of the hands of the twelve Apoſtles; for it is ſaid, Acts vi. 2. "the twelve "called the multitude of the diſciples unto them," &c. That the Apoſtles appointed others to ſucceed to their own order, is evident from the caſe of Timothy; who in the antient ſuperſcription, at the end of the ſecond Epiſtle, is ſaid to have been "ordained the firſt biſhop of the church "of the Epheſians." He is admoniſhed to "lay hands "ſuddenly on no man;" therefore he had power to ordain: and he is likewiſe admoniſhed not to "receive an accuſa- "tion againſt an elder, (or preſbyter) but before two or "three witneſſes:" therefore he had a judicial authority over that order. Directions are given with reſpect to the deacons of the ſame church; therefore, in the firſt church of the Epheſians, there was a biſhop, with elders and deacons under him; as in the church which began at Jeruſalem, there was the order of the Apoſtles, of the diſciples, and of the deacons. In the Chriſtian church, throughout the world, we find theſe three orders of miniſters for fifteen hundred years, without interruption. The fact therefore is undeniable, that the church has been governed by biſhops, prieſts, and deacons, from the Apoſtles downwards; and where we find theſe orders of miniſters duly appointed, the word preached, and the ſacraments adminiſtered, there we find the church of Chriſt, with its form, and its authority.

The

The wiſdom of God is here very evident, in appointing the orders of the Chriſtian miniſtry after the pattern of the Jewiſh church, which was of his own appointment ſo long before. That there might be no uncertainty in a caſe of ſuch conſequence to the ſouls of men, there was no novelty, but a continuation of the like adminiſtration with that which had all along been known and acknowledged in the church. Aaron was an high prieſt, with a miniſtry peculiar to himſelf; under him there was an order of prieſts, twenty-four in number, who ſerved by courſe in the daily ſacrifices and devotions of the tabernacle and temple; and theſe were aſſiſted by the whole tribe of the Levites. As the law had its paſſover, its baptiſms, its incenſe, its ſacrifices, its conſecrations, its benedictions, all to be realized under the ſacraments and offerings of the Goſpel; ſo its miniſtry was but a pattern of the miniſtry which is now amongſt us; and we cannot miſtake the one, if we have an eye to the other; ſuch is the goodneſs of God in directing and keeping us, through all the confuſions of the latter days, by a rule of ſuch great antiquity, to the way of truth, and keeping us in it.

The great uſe of the church is to receive and miniſter to the ſalvation of thoſe who are taken out of the world: but this it cannot do without the truth of the Chriſtian doctrine; the church is therefore as an inſtrument, or candleſtick, for the holding and preſerving of this ſacred light. It is called the "pillar and ground of the truth;" not as if it had any right of making or impoſing doctrines of its own; for the ground and the pillar do not make the roof, they only ſupport it; nor doth the candleſtick make the light, it only holds the light. And theſe ſimilitudes will be found juſt, if we purſue them farther; for as when the pillars are removed, the building muſt fall; and when the lamp or the candleſtick is broken, the light will be extinct; ſo if the church be taken away, the truth falls along with it; as we have ſeen, and do ſee, in this country. Our Quakers, who are fartheſt from the church, are totally departed from the truth of Chriſtian doctrine; and many of thoſe ſeparate congregations,

gations, who were Puritans and Believers in the laſt age, are Socinians and Infidels in this: a conſideration which ſhould prevail upon ſincere people of all perſuaſions, who believe in Jeſus Chriſt as their Lord and Saviour, to lay aſide their animoſity, and unite againſt the Socinians, who are the common enemies of all Chriſtian people, and are now endeavouring to overthrow the faith of our creeds and articles.

When we ſpeak of the uſe of the church, we ſhould never forget the great benefit and information which ariſes from the faſts and feſtivals of the church; (totally neglected by the ſectaries) by the courſe of which, the piety of Chriſtians is directed to all the great ſubjects of the Goſpel: ſome of which might otherwiſe never be revived in our thoughts during the whole year. But the church ſpends its year with Jeſus Chriſt, and follows him in faith, through all the great works of his mediatorial office, from his advent to the ſending down of the Holy Ghoſt on the day of Pentecoſt. On this ground, the work of Mr. Nelſon is of great value to all Chriſtian families; and we have reaſon to hope it will never fall into diſuſe: though all perſons, fanatically inclined, are very cold to the merits of it, and the ſectaries, it is to be ſuppoſed, muſt totally reject it on their own principles.

Here I muſt add, that the wiſdom of God is farther manifeſt, in appointing a proviſion for his miniſters, independent of the people. The maintenance of the Jewiſh prieſthood was from God; for the tythes and offerings, on which they lived, were firſt dedicated to God, and from him transferred for the ſupport of his miniſtry. So doth he himſelf ſtate the caſe by the prophet: "Ye have robbed "me," ſaith he, "in tythes and offerings;" as if they were his own property: and ſo they were; for being dedicated to God, the firſt proprietor of all things, they belong to him before they belong to his church. The wiſdom and piety of Chriſtian ſtates followed the rule of the Scripture from the earlieſt times; and it ſtill obtains in this country. And what would be the conſequence if it were not ſo

While

While the miniſter depends only upon the God to whom he is accountable, he dares ſpeak the truth: but where he is dependent on the people, and the people are corrupt, then he muſt accommodate himſelf to their fancy. For this reaſon, if the people of a congregation, who chuſe their own miniſter, fall into hereſy, they rarely or never get out of it, becauſe they will bear no teacher, but one who is of their own perſuaſion, and will flatter them in their errors.

I have nothing more to ſay upon the nature of the church, but to ſhew the extent of its authority. Every ſociety muſt have power over its own members, to admit or exclude as the caſe requires: it cannot otherwiſe ſubſiſt. The church, from the days of the Apoſtles, always exerciſed the power of excommunicating notorious offenders, and of abſolving and reſtoring true penitents. Excommunication is an excluſion from the church; and they who have authority to baptize, muſt have authority to excommunicate. The church muſt alſo have authority in directing its own worſhip and ſervices, as to time, place, ceremonies. "Let all things be done "decently and in order:" but what is decency, and what is order, is not ſpecified, and muſt be left to the diſcretion of the rulers of the church. The church has no authority to ordain any thing contrary to the law of God; nor doth the law of God depend upon the authority of the church. There are three ſorts of things about which the church is converſant; good, bad, and indifferent: the good oblige by their own nature; the bad cannot be enforced by any authority: therefore the authority of the church muſt extend to things indifferent, that is, to order and diſcipline, to circumſtances of time, place, forms of worſhip, ceremonies, and ſuch like: and to diſobey becauſe they are indifferent is to deny that God hath given power to his church to regulate any one thing whatſoever.

Ought we not, on the foregoing conſiderations, to magnify the goodneſs and wiſdom of God, who hath provided a church for the reception of loſt mankind, and given to it the light of truth, and the means of grace? No ſubject can be plainer than this of the nature and conſtitution of the church:

church: and the neceſſity of its miniſtry and ordinances to the ſalvation of man, and the preſervation of truth, charity, peace, and godlineſs, is as clear as the ſun. What a bleſſed thing it would be for us, if all people could ſee this! What temptations, corruptions, tumults, and miſeries, would it prevent amongſt mankind! But, alas, they are ever ingenious in defeating the purpoſes of God for their own good. They have ways and expedients, not only of making themſelves eaſy without the benefits of the Chriſtian church, but of actually caſting them all off with a high hand, as needleſs, ſuperſtitious, dangerous, and even ſinful, and antichriſtian; not helps to ſalvation, but hindrances. How this matter is, and with what reaſonings they deceive themſelves, we ſhall diſcover with very little inquiry.

CHAP. III.

THE ERRORS WHICH TEMPT MEN TO LEAVE THE CHURCH, AND MAKE THEM EASY WHEN THEY ARE SEPARATED FROM IT.

THE means of grace, and the promiſes of God, being with his church, they who would be made partakers of them, muſt apply to the church: and who would not? Who would not willingly flee from Sodom on fire to take refuge in Zoar? When the ſtorm is abroad, the beaſts have ſenſe to fly to a place of ſhelter: and as the wrath of God is denounced againſt this world, men muſt be enemies to themſelves, if they refuſe to be delivered in the way which God hath appointed. But we know nothing of this world, if we think all men are friends to their own ſpiritual intereſt. Many will rather have recourſe to their own imaginations: and when pride hath got poſſeſſion of them, they are above being directed.

The example of Naaman is very inſtructive on this part of our ſubject. When he was ordered to ſeek the cure of his

his leproſy, by waſhing ſeven times in Jordan, the proud Syrian refuſed to comply with the ceremony, becauſe he could not ſee how it ſhould have any effect. Nevertheleſs, when he had thought better of it, that ceremony, unaccountable and uſeleſs as it might ſeem to his carnal reaſon, cured him of his diſtemper. By the church and its ordinances, every Chriſtian is put to the ſame trial; whether he will ſubmit to ſuch things as reaſon cannot account for? Whether he will look for an effect, to which the cauſe is not adequate, without the interpoſition of an inviſible power? The children of God are ſtill exerciſed by this trial. Some accept the terms propoſed; they believe the promiſes of God, and are ſaved. Of the reſt, ſome do not ſee how they can be ſaved in this manner; and others ſpend their lives in vanity, and never think whether they can or cannot. Men are influenced by two principles totally oppoſite, ſight and faith: the Chriſtian walks by faith and not by ſight; the diſputer of this world believes nothing but what he ſees, and ſo is incapable of the benefits of Chriſtianity. It does not appear to him how power can come from heaven, and be delivered down in ſucceſſion by the impoſition of hands: how water, which waſhes the body, can waſh away ſins; how bread can be made the vehicle of a ſpiritual life; ſo he lives and dies the dupe of a dead philoſophy, which admits of nothing ſpiritual in a religion whoſe benefits are all of a ſpiritual kind.

From the nature of the church, we ſee how neceſſary it is, that men ſhould be taken into it out of this wicked world. We ſee how the promiſes of God are confined to the ordinances of the church; and that there can be no aſſurance of ſalvation without them. If we reflect on theſe things, we cannot but conſider it as an ineſtimable bleſſing, that God hath appointed ſuch a plain and certain way of leading us through the means of grace, to the hope of glory. We may perhaps wonder why men ſhould endeavour to deprive themſelves of theſe benefits; and how Chriſtian people, ſo called, can ſatisfy themſelves under a cauſeleſs departure from the great law of peace and charity. I will therefore

therefore proceed to ſhew how they deceive themſelves. There are three falſe principles, which, if admitted, would ſuperſede the neceſſity of any church.

The firſt of theſe is the doctrine of an abſolute unconditional election to ſalvation. For if God, by a mere act of his ſovereign will, and according to an irreverſible decree, elects men to eternal ſalvation, without regard to conditions and circumſtances; then no viſible ordinances are neceſſary as means of grace; they are all ſuperſeded, and we are as ſafe without them as with them. This doctrine is ſo convenient to all the irregular claſſes of Chriſtian people, who have caſt off the church and its authority; that it has been much inſiſted upon almoſt from the beginning of the Reformation; and has done infinite miſchief. For he who is divided from his brethren, with this doctrine in his mind, is thereby confirmed and fortified in his errors. In vain ſhall we recommend the benefits of church communion to him, who is ſaved in conſequence of a decree, made before the church or the world had a being. God hath elected him, without any regard to outward ordinances; and ſo the want of thoſe ordinances can never render his election of no effect. And ſuppoſing his doctrine to be true, who can deny the conſequence? But the doctrine is falſe. Thus much of it is true; that, according to the Scripture, man is choſen, or elected, "out of the world," by the free grace of God, without any reſpect to his own works, (of which he can have none till he is called; being in the ſtate of an unborn infant) and brought into God's church, where he is placed in a ſtate of ſalvation. But he may fall from this ſtate, or be caſt out of it by the authority which brought him into it, and forfeit all the privileges of his election; therefore the Apoſtle gives us this warning; "let him that thinketh he ſtandeth, take heed leſt he fall:" and St. Peter bids us "give diligence to make our calling "and election ſure." How can that be, if we are elected to ſalvation, by an irreverſible decree? We need take no pains to make that ſure, which in its nature is irreverſible. Paul was a veſſel choſen of God; and yet this ſame Paul

ſuppoſes

ſuppoſes it poſſible for him to fall from the grace of God, and become a caſtaway. Election therefore, as it is ſpoken of in the Scripture, hath been groſsly miſunderſtood: for there is no ſuch thing there as any election of individuals to final ſalvation, independent of the ordinances of the church. Election is an inward and ſpiritual grace; but there is no ſuch thing adminiſtered to man without ſome outward ſign. A man might tell us that he is ordained to preach the Goſpel: but we know this can never be without the laying on of hands. He may tell us he is one of God's elect; and if the reality of his election were to depend upon his own report, how ſhould we confute him, although he were guilty of all manner of wickedneſs? If we believe him on his own authority, we may be tempted to be as wicked as he is: and multitudes have by this doctrine corrupted one another, and fallen into what is called antinomianiſm; a neglect of God's commandments, as not neceſſary to thoſe who are elected independent of works and ſacraments. To ſecure us from all ſuch deluſions, God hath affixed ſome outward ſign or pledge to all his inward gifts, to aſſure us of their reality, and prevent impoſture. Therefore, where there is an inward calling, there is an outward calling with it; where there is regeneration, there is the ſacrament of baptiſm; and the Goſpel knows of no regeneration without it. I might ſhew how this doctrine of abſolute election is diſhonourable to God, and contrary to his moſt expreſs declarations. How it encourages ſome to preſumption, pride, and ungodly living *; and how it

* I remember a woman in a country pariſh, who uſed to boaſt much of her own experiences, and inſult the people of the church as reprobates; goats who were to be placed on the left hand, at the day of judgment; while ſhe and her party were the true elect, the ſheep who were to be placed on the right hand. Such was the uſual ſtrain of her converſation. But after a time, I heard that this elect lady was gone off with the huſband of another woman. She was a ſevere critic on the clergyman of the pariſh, as one who had many popiſh actions, becauſe he made a practice of turning to the eaſt when he repeated the creed; and though he was much attended to as a preacher, ſhe ſaid it all ſignified no more than the barking of a dog.

drives

drives others to deſpair and diſtraction *, who have not, nor can bring themſelves to an aſſurance of their own perſonal election to the favour of God: but my buſineſs in this place is only to remark, how convenient this doctrine is to all thoſe who do not come to God in the ordinary way of his inſtitutions, nor can prove themſelves to be members of his church.

A ſecond doctrine, on the ground of which men place themſelves above the church, is that of immediate inſpiration. For if men are now receiving new direction from heaven, and God ſpeaks in them as he did in Moſes and the Prophets, and the Apoſtles, they have no need to conſult either the Scriptures or the church: for they are independent of both, and have an higher rule. This is the reaſon why no impreſſion can ever be made upon a Quaker, by arguments from the Scripture. He anſwers, that the Scriptures (as applied by us who do not underſtand them) cannot be brought in evidence againſt him; becauſe (to ſpeak in the Quaker language) he has within himſelf the ſame ſpirit that gave forth the Scriptures; and the revelation which is paſt, muſt give place to that which is preſent. Nothing blinds the eyes of men ſo effectually as pride; whence he who is vain enough to believe, that he is under the direction of immediate inſpiration, muſt believe many other ſtrange things. Such people therefore never fail to deſpiſe the miniſtry and worſhip of the church, and make light of all its inſtitutions. The Apoſtles of Jeſus Chriſt foreſeeing by a true revelation, that there would be falſe pretenſions to inſpiration in the Chriſtian church, as there were falſe prophets among the people of the Jews, give us warning not to "believe every ſpirit," (that is, not to believe all thoſe who pretend to ſpeak by the ſpirit) but to try them whether

* When Dr. Sparrow was biſhop of Exeter, there rarely paſſed a day, without a note or notes brought to prieſt, vicar, or reader, for the prayers of the congregation, for perſons troubled in mind, or poſſeſſed; which, as ſome judicious perſons conjectured, was occaſioned by the frequent preaching up of the rigid predeſtination doctrines in ſome places in that city.

Preface to the View of the Times.

they ſpeak by the ſpirit of truth or the ſpirit of error. There are many good rules to direct us on this occaſion: but there is one which every body can underſtand. The ſpirit of truth is the ſpirit of love, and peace, and unity: the ſpirit of error is the ſpirit of hatred, and contention, and diſcord. The former tends to unite men into one body; the latter ſets them at variance, and divides them into parties. "Beloved," ſaith St. John, "let us love one another; for "every one that loveth is born of God, and knoweth God. "He that loveth not, knoweth not God." When the great rule of charity is broken, and men lay claim to the ſpirit of God, while they have no title to it, then they are open to the deluſions of evil ſpirits: and accordingly many have uttered hideous blaſphemies, under a perſuaſion that they were ſpeaking by the ſpirit of God. Some have proceeded ſo far as to perſonate God himſelf *. Certain it is, that the ſect who have departed farthest from the church and its ordinances, are the moſt forward in their pretenſions to immediate inſpiration; and even where this is pretended to in a leſſer degree, a contempt for the church and its miniſtry, ſeldom or never fails to attend upon it in the ſame proportion †.

A third doctrine which makes the church of no effect, is the ſufficiency of moral virtue; and a perilous doctrine it is. It comes forward with a more ſober face, but this error hath

* In the beginning of this century, there was a ſect of Camiſar Quakers in London, in whoſe aſſemblies perſons of both ſexes, particularly young girls, pretended to deliver prophecies, with ſtrange ſcreamings and diſtortions. One of theſe people, (horrible to relate) was ſeen to take another by the arm, and looking him broad in the face, ſaid, "Do you not acknowledge me to be the eternal and unchangeable God?" To which the other, falling down and trembling, anſwered, "I do acknowledge thee," &c. Many fine people from the court end of the town, who would have paid but little reſpect to the benediction of a biſhop, were ſeen bending their knees, for a bleſſing, to theſe frantic females. See View of the Times, Vol. IV. p. 235.

† The author of the "Snake in the Graſs" prefixed a moſt excellent preface to that work, on the enthuſiaſm of Antonia Bourignon; ſhewing the origina and tendency of hers and every other deluſion of the ſame kind: which preface the reader will do well to conſult.

leſs

leſs of the Goſpel than that of enthuſiaſm or predeſtination. For on this ground, a man need be of no church, of no ſect, nor even a Chriſtian believer; becauſe moral honeſty, which forbears thieving and cheating, may be found in a Turk or an Heathen. When people would appear to be what they are not, and endeavour to ſupply their defects by fine words and plauſible pretences, we call them hypocrites: and I will aſſure the reader, there is a great deal of cant in the world, beſide that of fanaticiſm and affected devotion. Impiety can act the hypocrite upon occaſion, and magnify moral virtue when it is ſet in oppoſition to the love of God. It is not unuſual for perſons to praiſe a man's character; not becauſe they love his virtues, but becauſe they hate his rival. So do ſome bad men praiſe morality, becauſe they hate devotion. This is too frequently the caſe with thoſe who make a falſe eſtimate of what they call a good life; leaving out the duties moſt eſſential to the life of a good Chriſtian; and theſe are a very large party. Hereſy and ſchiſm, till they turn into profligacy, never fail to deſcant upon the ſufficiency of moral duties; and in this they are joined by the whole tribe of Deiſts, Infidels, and moral Philoſophers, who are glad to hear of a rule of morality, (ſuch, by the way, as themſelves are to define and determine) which will ſerve them as a ſubſtitute for the Chriſtian life, and all the forms of church devotion. Here alſo we find thoſe Chriſtians, who live in the habitual neglect of the means of grace. I have heard people who never were at the altar, and perhaps never intended it, comforting themſelves with this conſideration, that they never did any harm to any body: when they ſhould rather have aſked themſelves, what good they ever did to themſelves, or to any body elſe, for the love of God? Without which, all the virtues of man are nothing; and if he places any dependance upon them, they are worſe than nothing. If a man is to be ſaved by the Chriſtian religion, he muſt be a Chriſtian in his life: but ſimple morality is not Chriſtian: it has neither faith, hope, charity, prayer, faſting, nor alms, which are the duties of the Chriſtian life. If we mean to ſerve

God, we muſt ſerve him in his church, and conform to its ordinances. If we do good to our neighbours, we muſt do it on a principle of faith; and a cup of cold water given on this principle, is of more value in the ſight of God, than all the treaſures of the Indies, if they are diſtributed from the proud heart of unbelief: and he is certainly in unbelief, who doth not direct himſelf by the rules, and act upon the principles, which God hath delivered to the church in the holy Scriptures.

Nearly related to the ſufficiency of moral virtue, is the principle of ſincerity, which was ſet up in the laſt age, as ſufficient of itſelf to juſtify man in the ſight of God, independent of the authority and benefits of his church: ſo that if a man be not a hypocrite, it matters not what religion he is of. If ſincerity, as ſuch, independent of any particular way of worſhip, can recommend man to the favour of God, then there can be no difference as to merit between a ſincere martyr, and a ſincere perſecutor; and he that burn a Chriſtian, if he be but in earneſt, hath the ſame title to God's favour, as he that is burnt for believing in Jeſus Chriſt. This poſition, (in the ſenſe of it) abſurd and monſtrous as it muſt appear, was the ſupport of a controverſy in this kingdom, in which a biſhop led the way *, and was followed and applauded by all the libertines and looſe thinkers of the nation, who foreſaw that the argument would end in the diſſolution of the church as a ſociety: and therefore they made him a thouſand compliments.

* Thus did the famous biſhop Hoadley comfort all the ſectaries and enthuſiaſts of his time: "When you are ſecure of your integrity before God—this will lead you not to be afraid of the terrors of men, or the vain words of regular and uninterrupted ſucceſſion, authoritative benedictions, excommunications—nullity, or validity of ordinances to the people on account of niceties and trifles, or any other the like dreams." I can venture to ſay, there never was a cauſe more effectually baffled and expoſed upon earth, than this of biſhop Hoadley againſt the church, and church communion, in the two Letters, and the Reply of Mr. William Law, which every clergyman of the church of England ought to read, that he may know what ground he ſtands upon, and againſt what enemies he may be called forth to maintain it.

If

If we conſider how the mind of man is influenced by cuſtom and education, and that his conſcience and ſelf-approbation will be according to his principles, then we ſhall ſee that ſincerity, if admitted, would ſanctify all the wickedneſs under heaven. St. Paul, as a zealous Jew, verily thought (that is, he was ſincere in his opinion) that he ought to do many things contrary to the name of Jeſus of Nazareth; ſo he perſecuted the Chriſtians furiouſly, and breathed out threatnings and ſlaughter. Now, as he had a good meaning in all he did, to what end was he converted, when his ſincerity would have ſaved him in his former way? After his mind was better enlightened, he pronounced himſelf to have been the greateſt of ſinners, for what he had thus done in the ſincerity of his heart.

Thus it would be in all other caſes; he that acts ſincerely upon bad principles, muſt be a bad man; a corrupt tree cannot bring forth good fruit: and, "not he that commendeth himſelf is approved, but whom the Lord commendeth." Upon the whole, he that will be ſaved, muſt be ſaved in the way which God hath appointed, and not in any way of his own. We ſhall be judged at laſt according to God's word, not according to any perſuaſions we may have taken up, through the prejudices of education, or the perverſeneſs of our own hearts; all of which are indeed no better than dreams, having no foundation but on that looſe bottom of human imagination, on which are built all the viſions of the night, and all the hereſies in the world.

If theſe doctrines of abſolute election, immediate inſpiration, the ſufficiency of moral virtue, and juſtification from ſincerity, were true, it would follow, that God is unwiſe, inconſiſtent and improvident. For if he appoints a viſible church, and its ordinances, as neceſſary to make us members of the kingdom of heaven; and if he began the way of ſalvation by "adding to the church ſuch as were to "be ſaved;" and yet, with all this, has another private way of ſaving men, by a ſecret decree which has no regard to any outward means, he is inconſiſtent in ordaining them. And alſo, as the doctrine of immediate inſpiration, or new

revelation, without any ſigns or credentials from heaven, opens a way to every poſſible deluſion of the mind, either from its own vain conceits, or the ſuggeſtions of evil ſpirits, God muſt be improvident in not ſecuring us againſt ſuch dangerous impoſitions, which may introduce all kinds of wickedneſs into the world, under the ſanction of a divine authority: an impoſtor having nothing to do, but to perſuade himſelf, as any madman may do, that he acts by immediate inſpiration. With this perſuaſion, men have butchered one another to make bloody baptiſms; have ſet themſelves up as kings and rulers of the new Jeruſalem; have taken plurality of wives, and blaſphemouſly perſonated God himſelf *. All the diſorders of the laſt century were committed by fanatics, who aſſumed a privilege of ſeeking the Lord, and conſulting, and receiving anſwers from him; while their minds were bent upon the moſt horrible crimes of rebellion, robbery, ſacrilege, perſecution, and murder.

Then as to moral virtue; if that can ſave thoſe who are not added to the church, it muſt follow, that man never was loſt, and that Chriſt need not have come into the world. If ſincerity in any perſuaſion, good or bad, will recommend us to the favour of God, then will lies, if we do but believe them, anſwer all the purpoſes of truth: then is there no difference between good and evil; and it cannot be worth while to convert Jews, Turks, or Heathens, to the Goſpel, becauſe they are as ſafe in their own way. Such are the pleas by which ſome men of neceſſity, and ſome of malignity, ſeek to juſtify themſelves, when they leave the church, or deſpiſe, or neglect its ordinances. But "the foundation "of God ſtandeth ſure."

After what has been ſaid, few words will be wanting to convince any thinking perſon of the dangers and evil conſequences which muſt attend the ſin of cauſeleſs ſeparation.

* See Roſs's View of all Religions; particularly the Account of the Anabaptiſts of Germany. There was a treatiſe publiſhed under the name of a Hiſtory of Modern Enthuſiaſm, between the years 1750 and 1760. We wiſh it were re-publiſhed. It gives a curious proſpect of the effects of enthuſiaſm.

If

If men for ſalvation are brought out of the world into the church, they cannot poſſibly forſake it, without hazard to their ſalvation. If the promiſes of God, and the means of grace are committed to the church, we loſe them when we leave the church: at leaſt it will be very hard to prove that we carry them away with us: and who would chuſe to be under any uncertainty in a caſe of ſuch importance?

Another evil is that of breaking the great rule of charity in our worſhip. We are commanded to glorify God with one mind and one mouth, and all to ſpeak the ſame thing. How contrary to this is the practice of following different ways of worſhip; ſome totally diſagreeing with others; and ſome not deſerving the name of any worſhip at all; for in ſome of our aſſemblies, people meet to no purpoſe but to hear one another talk. There is no praying, no confeſſion of ſins, no abſolution, no thankſgiving, no litany, no ſacraments! We read that the Apoſtles, when the Holy Ghoſt deſcended, were "all with one accord in one place;" and ſo ought Chriſtians to be, if they would preſerve the preſence of the ſpirit amongſt them, who is the ſpirit of unity. And as the ſpirit of unity in worſhip diſpoſes men to a more peaceable and charitable temper, ſo the ſpirit of diviſion and fanaticiſm is attended with violence and bitterneſs of language, and an intolerant perſecuting humour toward all who are not fanatics; eſpecially toward the members of the church of England, which is deſervedly placed at the head of the Proteſtant reformation *.

There

* An author who put out a Syllabus of Lectures, in the year 1778, on the Principles of Non-conformity, ſpeaks in the perſon of Jeſus Chriſt, upon the tribunal of judgment at the laſt day, and ſuppoſes him preſenting to the world, on that tremendous occaſion, his faithful ſervants, the Non-conformiſt miniſters, as the great objects of his favour; and at the ſame time ſending off thoſe holy tyrants, the biſhops of the church of England, into everlaſting fire, with that dreadful ſentence—DEPART! And what are they to be damned for? Becauſe they could not approve of non-conformity! a religion of negatives! They ſaw enough of its fruits to diſlike it in former times, from its firſt appearance in this kingdom: but they did not ſee, as we do now, that its end is infidelity: to which it hath been tending for many

There is alſo great hazard of loſing the doctrines, when we leave the worſhip of the church. When the ten tribes revolted from the worſhip at Jeruſalem, they ſoon loſt the

years paſt, and hath now attained it in the writings of Dr. Prieſtley, and the Unitarian aſſociation. Theſe lectures, with this dreadful ſentence of damnation to the biſhops, by Brother Robinſon, were approved by the Eaſter Aſſociation of Eſſex, at Harlow, and recommended to the ſiſter-churches by order of all. June 18, 1778. Of what character muſt theſe ſiſter-churches be, if they are of the ſame ſpirit with Brother Robinſon? Surely they are not chaſte virgins, preſentable to a meek and merciful Saviour, who prayed for his murderers; but unmerciful harlots, curſing and damning the eſtabliſhed church for retaining epiſcopacy. Had there been no non-conformity, the poor biſhops might have eſcaped like other men, and have been entitled to their chance of mercy through the merits of their Redeemer, who died for them, and for all men, and ſent forth the firſt biſhops by his own immediate authority. What would ſuch non-conformiſts do, if they had it in their power, who are provoked to ſuch uncharitable ravings under the preſent moſt mild and moderate ſtate of the church of England? The Lectures of Brother Robinſon, we are informed, were produced in the Houſe of Commons when the teſt act was in queſtion.

But the moſt ſuperlative inſtance of fanatic malignity I ever yet ſaw, is to be found in the works of Milton, whoſe malignity was rendered more malignant by the depreſſed and afflicted condition to which the church was then reduced. He was a man of a bright and perfect imagination, and gifted with a wonderful choice of beautiful and deſcriptive expreſſions. But the weapon is the worſe for its ſharpneſs, when malice hath the handling of it: and imagination is a mirror which can reflect the fires of hell as well as the lights of heaven; of which, I think, we have an example in the following invective againſt the biſhops of the church of England: 'But they—that by the impairing and diminution of the true faith, the diſtreſſes and ſervitude of their country, aſpire to high dignity, rule, and promotion here, after a ſhameful end in this life (which God grant them!) ſhall be thrown down eternally into the darkeſt and deepeſt gulph of hell; where under the deſpiteful control, the trample and ſpurn of all the other damned, who, in the anguiſh of their torture, ſhall have no other eaſe than to exerciſe a raving and beaſtial tyranny over them, as their ſlaves and negroes, they ſhall remain in that plight for ever, the baſeſt, the lowermoſt, the moſt dejected, moſt underfoot, and down trodden vaſſals of perdition.' Concluſion of Milton's Treatiſe on Reformation: Vol. I. p. 274. If it were put to my option, whether I would be an ideot, without a ſingle faculty of mind, or a ſingle ſenſe of the body; or whether I would have Milton's imagination, attended with this fiery ſpirit of fanaticiſm, I ſhould not heſitate one moment to determine.

truth

truth of their law, and fell into an idolatrous worſhipping of the calves they had ſet up in Dan and Bethel. Their government was troubled with great diſorders, and their confuſion ended in their utter diſperſion. When men leave the worſhip of the church, it is very natural for them to become diſaffected to its doctrines: and they who hate the Chriſtian faith, will take part with thoſe who are againſt the church; becauſe they foreſee, that if the church be deſtroyed, the faith will be loſt; as the light goes out when the lamp is broken. One of the moſt malicious books that ever was written in this country againſt the Chriſtian faith, was all of it apparently directed againſt the church: on which conſideration, many, who then believed the Chriſtian doctrines, were drawn in by a diſaffection to the church, to take part with an infidel.

2. I am to remark farther, that with thoſe who are ignorant and ill-inſtructed in the nature and uſe of the church, there is a perverſe prejudice in favour of preaching; and conſequently a ſhocking neglect of thoſe duties which belong to the people. It is a fine eaſy way for people with itching ears, to hear a preacher talk them into heaven; while they neglect all the more eſſential parts of divine worſhip. Many hear a ſermon with the ſame vain curioſity as people hear a ſpeech upon a ſtage, and conſult nothing but their own amuſement. And while the whole of the miniſterial duty is ſuppoſed to conſiſt in preaching, a man, who can baul and rant, is tempted to take himſelf for a miniſter of Jeſus Chriſt, without any regular miſſion; of which ſort we have multitudes in this kingdom at this time: and it is to be feared they are increaſing. It is no uncommon thing for perſons of all perſuaſions to meet in the ſame church to hear the ſame preacher; many of whom have no communion with one another at any other time: how is a preacher to pleaſe ſuch a mixt multitude of hearers, but by leaving the church of Chriſt out of the queſtion, and preaching a looſe ſort of religion, which will fit them all? Perhaps, if he were to ſpeak the plain truth, and, from a ſincere regard to their ſouls, give them ſuch information as they ſtand moſt

in

in need of, many of them would leave him with indignation: as there were thoſe who would walk no longer with Jeſus Chriſt, becauſe they were not able to bear the things that were ſpoken by him. There is a faſhion of inviting people to come to Chriſt, without telling them where and how he is to be found. Beſides, it is a great miſtake to ſuppoſe, that the whole of religion conſiſts in our taking of Chriſt; it is beginning at the wrong end: for Chriſt is to take us, as he took the little children in his arms, and gave them his bleſſing*. He ſaid to his diſciples, "ye have not "choſen me, but I have choſen you." There is a covenant between us and God, into which God, of his infinite grace, takes us; we do not take him, neither can we: and this confines us to the ordinances of the church, which are not of us, but are the gifts of God's free grace to us miſerable ſinners: and Chriſtians are united to God, and to one another, by the ſervices of prayer, and the participation of the ſacraments, more than by the hearing of the word of God without them; which many hear for reaſons of vanity and uncharitableneſs. Who are the beſt friends every miniſter hath in his pariſh? They who attend the prayers and ſacraments with him; who are edified by his prieſthood as well as by his preaching; and are active in the great work of their own ſalvation.

3. As the latter times of the Jewiſh church were very corrupt, and the doctrines of God were rendered of none effect by the inventions of men, it is agreeable to the prophecies of the New Teſtament, that offences muſt come amongſt us; that men muſt ariſe, out of the church, "ſpeak- "ing perverſe things, to draw away diſciples after them:"

* Mr. Locke, in his Reaſonableneſs of Chriſtianity, (a ſtrange piece of divinity) is in the ſame miſtake. He makes baptiſm a viſible act, whereby thoſe, who believed Chriſt to be the Meſſiah, received him as their king. So again in the ſame ſtyle, he ſays, that by baptiſm men enroll themſelves in the kingdom of Jeſus; which is but to ſay in other words, that they write their own names in heaven. From ſuch language as this, it is too apparent that Mr. Locke's ideas of the Chriſtian prieſthood and ſacraments, were exceedingly low.

alſo

alſo that many will not "endure ſound doctrine, but heap "up to themſelves teachers, having itching ears."

Theſe, and many other like paſſages, give us notice that there muſt be a falling off from the faith, with confuſion and diſagreement in the Chriſtian ſociety. If we look at our own church, we have but a melancholy proſpect; and cannot help obſerving, that it approaches too near to the ſtate of the Jewiſh church before its deſtruction. As they had corrupted the doctrines of Moſes and the prophets, and in conſequence of it were divided into ſects, (for as truth unites, error always divides men) ſo have we corrupted the doctrines of the Goſpel, and are miſerably divided in conſequence of it. I could name ſome doctrines, which if our Saviour were now to deliver in the metropolis of London, with the ſame freedom and authority as he did at Jeruſalem, I verily believe he would be perſecuted and put to death by people called Chriſtians, as he was of old by thoſe who were called Jews. The church of Jeruſalem was infeſted with temporiſing and philoſophiſing Jews, who were fartheſt of all others from the faith, while they affected to be wiſer than all the reſt of the people. The Sadducees believed neither angel nor ſpirit, and ſaid there was no reſurrection. The Herodians were politicians, and men of the world, who flattered Herod that he was the Meſſiah. The Phariſees were a proud ſanctified ſect, very godly in outward ſhew, but full of hypocriſy within. They juſtified themſelves, and deſpiſed others, as not good enough to ſtand near them, or belong to the ſame church with them. Of the ſect of the Eſſenes, we have no particular account in the New Teſtament; but from all we can learn, I take them to have been the Quakers of that time, who had thrown off all external rites of worſhip, and affected a religion perfectly pure and philoſophical. The Sadducees were the Socinians of Judaiſm; who had nothing ſpiritual belonging to them, and had reduced their law to an empty form. The venality and avarice of the Jews of our Saviour's time, were notorious, and provoked his indignation. Their temple, filled with buyers and ſellers, was turned into a den of thieves:

and,

and, God knows, there is too much of a worldly traffick amongſt us; which is too far gone to be reformed, and too bold to be cenſured—*venduntur omnia* !*

4. But whatever abuſes there may be in the church, it is our duty to make the beſt of it. The church is our ſpiritual mother; and we may apply thoſe words of the wiſe man, "deſpiſe not thy mother when ſhe is old;" not even if ſhe ſhould be in rags and dotage. The doctrine of the church of England is, by profeſſion, ſtill pure and apoſtolical; and, whatever faults it may have contracted, it cannot be worſe than the church which our Saviour found at Jeruſalem: yet he ſtill recommended to the congregation the duty of obedience to their ſpiritual rulers. "The "Scribes and the Phariſees ſit in Moſes' ſeat; all, there-"fore, whatſoever they bid you obſerve, that obſerve and "do." Bad as the church then was, our Saviour never forſook it, but "taught daily in the Temple;" and his Apoſtles attended upon its worſhip at the hours of prayer; and probably continued ſo to do, till they were diſperſed. Neither Chriſt nor his diſciples ever conſidered the doctrines of church authority, and ſucceſſion, and conformity, as vain words and idle dreams, as our Socinians have done of late years; and after what hath been ſaid, their views want no explanation.

5. In our behaviour toward thoſe who have departed from us, let not us, who honour the church, fall into the error of thoſe who deſpiſe it. Let us not betray any ſymptoms of pride in cenſuring with ſeverity, but rather, with hearts full of ſorrow and compaſſion, lament the differences and diviſions which expoſe the Chriſtian religion to the ſcorn of its enemies. Infidels are delighted to ſee that

* "CHURCH LIVING.

"Two thouſand pounds ready for the next preſentation to a rectory of adequate value, with immediate reſignation.—The advertiſer is ſixty-five years of age. Apply to Mr. ——, Attorney, Holborn."

Perjury, which is now in a very growing ſtate, may, in time, come to market with as much boldneſs as her ſiſter Simony hath done for many years paſt.

Chriſtians

Chriſtians cannot underſtand one another; from thence they are ready to report, that there is no ſenſe amongſt them all, nor any reaſon in their religion; for that, if there were, they would agree about it. In this alſo the Papiſts triumph; they boaſt of their advantage over the reformed, in that they are preſerved in peace and unity, while we are torn to pieces with factions and diviſions. Hence they reflect upon the whole reformation, as a natural ſource of confuſion; that they belong to Jeruſalem, and we to Babel; that when we leave their church, the city upon the hill, we never know where to ſtop, till we get to the bottom: that is, till we have run either into the madneſs of enthuſiaſm, or the profaneneſs of infidelity. How ſhall we ſtop this wide mouth of ſcandal, while appearances are ſo much againſt us? However, this reproach doth not reach us of the church of England; who, in doctrine and profeſſion, are where we were two hundred years ago. Let thoſe who have left us, try if they can anſwer the Papiſts upon this head: it is their buſineſs to account for the confuſion which they only have introduced.

If the clergy of this church have any deſire to preſerve it, they muſt conſider for what end the church is appointed. A Chriſtian church is a candleſtick, to hold forth the light of the Goſpel. When it ceaſes to anſwer that end, it is of no uſe as a church; and the world may do as well without it. Great things have been attributed of late times to moral preaching: but there is no ſuch thing as telling people what they are to do, without telling them what they are to believe; becauſe the Chriſtian morality is built upon the Chriſtian faith, and is totally different from the morality of Heathens. Deiſm, ſo called, is a religion without Chriſtianity; it has neither the Father, the Son, nor the Holy Ghoſt, into whoſe name Chriſtians are baptiſed. It has no ſacraments, no redemption, no atonement, no church communion, and conſequently no charity; for charity is the love and unity of Chriſtians as ſuch. Natural religion is but another name for Deiſm; it is the ſame thing in all reſpects; and I may challenge all the philoſophers in Europe to ſhew the difference.

There-

Therefore, to recommend moral duties on the ground of natural religion, is to preach Deiſm from a pulpit: and we ſhould aſk ourſelves whether God, who upholds his church, to declare ſalvation by Jeſus Chriſt alone, will preſerve a church, when it has left the Goſpel, and holds forth the light of Deiſm in the candleſtick which was made, and is ſupported in the world, only to hold forth the light of Chriſtianity? What elſe is it that hath made way for the enthuſiaſtic rant of the Tabernacle? When the wiſe forſake the Goſpel, then is the time for the unwiſe to take it up; but with ſuch a mixture of error and indiſcretion, as gives the world a pretence for never returning to it any more: and then the caſe is deſperate.

'Deiſm, properly ſo called,' (ſaith a certain writer) 'is the religion eſſential to man, the true original religion of reaſon and nature.—It is in Deiſm, properly ſo called, that our more diſcerning and rational divines have conſtantly placed the alone excellency and true glory of the Chriſtian inſtitution.'——'The Goſpel (ſays Dr. Sherlock) 'was a republication of the law of nature, and its precepts declarative of that original religion which was as old as the creation.'—'If natural religion' (ſays Mr. Chandler) 'be not a part of the religion of Chriſt, it is ſcarce worth while to enquire at all what his religion is: from whence it ſeems very natural to infer, that the other parts of the religion of Chriſt are ſcarce worth any thing at all of our notice.' [Deiſm fairly ſtated by a moral Philoſopher: p. 5, 6, 7.] See the whole book, which proceeds on this principle; that natural religion being admitted, it muſt be a perfect ſcheme, a compleat ſtructure; and that Chriſtianity, as a ſuperſtructure, is unneceſſary: and it is lamentable to ſee what advantage this author takes of the unguarded conceſſions of ſome celebrated Chriſtian preachers and controverſialiſts of the church of England, who did not foreſee, or did not conſider, the conſequences of their doctrines.

The Biſhop of Llandaff's Collection of Tracts, in ſix volumes, opens with the Theological Lectures of Dr. Taylor, of Norwich, a Diſſenting teacher; which ſhews his lordſhip's

lordſhip's great candour toward that party. In the firſt chapter of which Lectures, I find a rule of interpretation repugnant to the rule given us by the Scripture itſelf, which directs us to "compare ſpiritual things with ſpiritual;" that is, to compare the Scripture with the Scripture, that we may keep to the true ſenſe of it. But here it is laid down as a fundamental rule, that we ſhould always interpret the Scripture in a ſenſe "conſiſtent with the laws of natural religion; for that the law of nature, as it is founded in the unchangeable nature of things, muſt be the baſis and ground-work of every conſtitution of religion which God hath erected *." Now, with all due deference to his lordſhip's judgment in collecting properly for the edification of the clergy, and the people committed to their charge, this rule of Dr. Taylor prejudges the Scripture before we come to it, and inculcates into inexperienced ſtudents of divinity, the very principle that hath ruined us, and given us up as a prey to the Deiſts; it allows them the advantage they have contended for againſt the peculiar doctrines of revelation, as ſcarce worth any thing at all of our notice, in compariſon of natural religion. For here, I ſay, before we deſcend to the Scripture, we are poſſeſſed of a ſyſtem founded in the unchangeable nature of things; from which, whatſoever the Bible may ſeem to reveal, we are never to depart. Let us then ſuppoſe, that our Chriſtian baptiſm teaches us to believe in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt: What have we to do? Natural religion hath already determined, from the "unchangeable nature of things, that God is but one perſon †." Therefore we muſt interpret the form of baptiſm to ſuch a ſenſe, as will ſtill leave this doctrine of nature in poſſeſſion; either by teaching that the Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt, are in reality but one perſon, or that Jeſus Chriſt is no perſon in the Godhead, but a mere man, like ourſelves; or, that Chriſtianity is not true, &c. So in

* See Theolog. Tracts, vol. ii. p. 5.

† "This, (ſays Dr. Clarke) is the firſt principle of natural religion." See Mr. Jones's Catholic Doctrine of the Trinity, p. 15, of the ſixth edition; where this is conſidered more at large.

like manner, by another anticipation, natural religion makes every man his own prieſt and his own temple: therefore it cannot poſſibly admit the true and proper prieſthood of Jeſus Chriſt, but muſt reject the whole doctrine of atonement, and the corruption of man's nature; for this is incompatible with the idea of a natural religion, inaſmuch as corrupt nature muſt produce a corrupt religion. If we ſay that nature is not corrupt, we overturn the foundations of the Goſpel; which teaches us, that "the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God, neither can he know them."—Man, it ſeems, is ſo far from knowing the ſpiritual things revealed to him in the Scripture, that, as he now is by nature, he is not in a condition to receive them (they will be fooliſhneſs to him) till he is enabled ſo to do by a new faculty of diſcernment, which is ſupernatural and ſpiritual. It is therefore eaſy to foreſee what muſt be the conſequence, when Dr. Taylor's rule is admitted; and the younger clergy of this church, preſented (as I hear ſome of them are) with a copy of his lordſhip's collection, ſtudy divinity upon this ground. They will take the doctrines of nature, and work them up with the doctrines of the Scripture: that is, they will throw natural religion into the Scripture, as Aaron threw the gold of Egypt into the fire: and what will come out? Not the Chriſtian religion, but the philoſophical calf of Socinus.

Mr. Locke's Reaſonableneſs of Chriſtianity may be read with ſafety by thoſe who are already well learned in the Scripture: but if I had been of his lordſhip's counſel, I ſhould have thought it my duty to remonſtrate againſt the admiſſion of it into ſuch a collection. For what a perilous ſituation muſt that poor young man be in, who, perhaps, when he can but juſt conſtrue the Greek Teſtament, or before, is turned over to be handled and tutored by this renowned veteran; who, with a ſhew of reaſonableneſs, and ſome occaſional ſneers at orthodoxy, and affecting the piety and power of inſpiration itſelf, has partly overlooked, and partly explained away, the firſt and greateſt principles of Chriſtianity, and reduced it to a ſingle propoſition, conſiſtent

with Hereſy, Schiſm, Calviniſm, Arianiſm, Socinianiſm, and Quakeriſm.

His lordſhip hath introduced many other tracts of the Diſſenters, beſides the lectures of Dr. Taylor, for the uſe of the clergy of the church of England; and gives ſuch a reaſon for it, as hath a very fair and liberal appearance. But in order to make a right eſtimate of this meaſure, and prove it in the balance of truth and equity, let us change the ſcales. Let us ſuppoſe, that ſome Doctor in a Diſſenting, or peradventure (for ſuch it may be in this age) a Socinian academy, had compiled a miſcellaneous book for the uſe of the ſtudents, and had opened his collection with a courſe of inſtitution by ſome true and zealous divine of the church of England; I rather think the party would conſider him as a ſuſpicious character; who, under the maſk of candour and liberality, was ſlyly endeavouring to bring them all round about to orthodoxy and uniformity.

CHAP. IV.

ON THE ABUSE OF THE REFORMATION, &c.

TO the doctrines which are pleaded in defence of ſeparation, I might have added the uſe which has been made of the hiſtorical event of our reformation from the errors of the church of Rome. Here the Diſſenters are in confederacy with the Papiſts againſt us. The Papiſts object, that by the fact of our ſeparation from their church, the principle of ſeparation is admitted; and being once admitted, it will multiply ſects and diviſions amongſt us, and juſtify them all, as much as it juſtifies us. This is the very argument which the Diſſenters have repeated an hundred times; and they borrowed it originally from Rome, whoſe emiſſaries were detected among the Puritans in the days of Elizabeth, feeding them with reaſons and objections for the multiplying of ſchiſm, and the weakening of the epiſcopal church

of England: and God knows, they ſucceeded but too well. However, the link which unites theſe two parties, may eaſily be broken. They both agree, that the reformation of the church of England was a ſeparation from the church of Rome, of the ſame kind, and on the ſame principles, with the ſeparation of our Diſſenters. But to ſay this, is to aſſert that the Pope had a legal authority over the church of England, when in fact it was an uſurped authority; and the church of England reformed itſelf, as a national epiſcopal church, on the ground of its original independence on the ſee of Rome. Therefore, till our ſectaries have given up this point to the Papiſts, and made the church of England legally dependent on the authority of Rome, the caſe of our reformation affords no precedent to their ſeparation. This Biſhop Hoadley knew; therefore he allowed the authority of the church of Rome, and made the reformation of this church a forcible ſeparation, or ſchiſm, that all the ſectaries might be juſtified by our example. But he goes to a greater length; he maintains that we did not reform, becauſe the doctrines of the church of Rome were actually corrupt, but becauſe we thought them ſo; putting our reformation on the foot of opinion, not of reaſonable right, and actual knowledge: and opinion being once admitted as a rule of reformation, will hold as good againſt us, as againſt the Papiſts: nay, it will ſtop no where, till it make every man a church to himſelf, with ſuch doctrines as he likes, and without any one Chriſtian ordinance whatſoever. When we deſcend to reaſon and authority, a weak cauſe may ſoon be overthrown; but if opinion is to juſtify, the Quakers may ſtand their ground; and ſo may Socinians, Mahometans, Jews, and Heathens; becauſe the opinions of men, from the force of cuſtom and habit, will go with the perſuaſion in which they have been educated. The Papiſts wiſh to put all reformation from their church on ſuch a foot, that the principle may be ruined by its own abſurdity: and in this our ſectaries, with Biſhop Hoadley for their advocate, have given them all the advantage they can deſire.

Popular power is another engine which hath been turned againſt the church; that is, againſt the authority of God and his miniſters; and if this is admitted, then muſt that be right which the people ſet up, whatever it may be. All unlawful authority affects to ride in upon the backs of the people: and the patriots of Pagan Rome, while they trampled upon captive kings, and looked upon all nations as made to be their ſlaves, were always flattering the people of their own commonwealth, with the conceit of their own majeſty. The Geneva diſcipline went upon this principle; and they were followed therein by our Puritans and Independents. But the Scripture is ſo expreſly againſt it, that its friends were tempted to corrupt the text of the New Teſtament, to give it countenance. In the hiſtory of the ordaining of the ſeven deacons, in the ſixth chapter of the Acts, the text ſays—"whom WE may appoint over this "buſineſs"—giving the appointment to the Apoſtles. But the words were altered into—"whom YE may appoint"—giving the appointment to the people. One of the largeſt and the moſt numerous folio editions of the Bible ever printed in this country, which is that of Field, 1660, ſeveral copies of which are ſtill to be ſeen upon the reading-deſks in our churches, has this corruption; as many others had from the years 1640 to 1660. Field's edition was worked off in the time of the uſurpation, and was to have been publiſhed under the authority of the parliament; but not coming forth till after the reſtoration, the title page was changed, and it made its appearance *cum privilegio*.

From this falſification of the apoſtolical hiſtory, it is eaſy to foreſee (and every young reader ſhould be aware of it) how the Engliſh hiſtory, particularly that of the laſt century, muſt have ſuffered under the hands of the ſame party; what falſities and forgeries muſt have been propagated, to conceal the truth, to defame and blacken the beſt characters, and to juſtify the worſt. Sometimes theſe bold experiments brought the authors of them into great embarraſſment. Mr. Baxter, in two editions of his Saint's Everlaſting Reſt, printed before the year 1660, inſtead of the "kingdom of

" heaven," as it is in the Scripture, calls it the " parliament of heaven" (and, if like their own, it muſt have been a parliament without a king) and into this parliament he puts ſome of the regicides, and other like ſaints, who were then dead. But in the editions after the reſtoration, he drops them all out of heaven again, and reſtores the kingdom of God to its place. Lord Brook was one of the ſaints whom Baxter thus diſcanonized: of whoſe remarkable end Lord Clarendon gives an account; Vol. II. chap. vi. p. 114.

But to return to the ſubject of popular election. I have an author before me, a declaimer againſt prieſtcraft, who finds the right of the people in the hiſtory of the election of Matthias to the apoſtleſhip. " Matthias is elected," ſays he, " to teſtify that ordination might be valid by the votes of the people only, without the immediate interpoſition of heaven." He calls the aſſembly of Apoſtles and Diſciples, who were an hundred and twenty in number, " the people;" of whom we know that eleven were Apoſtles; that ſeventy more were ordained miniſters; and nothing appears, but that (the women excepted) all the reſt of the aſſembly were of the miniſtry likewiſe. But ſuppoſing them to be the people, how does it appear, that ordination was valid by their votes? Where is the account of this voting? The election is referred to God in the determination of a lot.— " Thou, Lord, ſhew whether of theſe two thou haſt choſen." Here the immediate interpoſition of heaven is applied for; but our orator ſays, this ordination was from the votes of the people only, without any ſuch interpoſition of heaven *. Theſe two examples may be ſufficient to ſhew the wretched ſhifts, and bold experiments, to which men are driven in the handling of the Scripture, to uphold the anti-chriſtian doctrine of a church derived from the authority of the people.

* See the Axe laid to the Root of Prieſtcraft, in four Diſcourſes. See Diſc. iv. p. 5.

A

SHORT VIEW

OF THE

PRESENT STATE

OF THE

ARGUMENT

BETWEEN THE

CHURCH OF ENGLAND

AND THE

DISSENTERS.

A

SHORT VIEW, &c.

THE excellent Hooker, in the preface to his Eccleſiaſtical Polity, gives us a curious and clear account of the zeal and artifice with which the firſt Puritans maintained and recommended their ſchiſm againſt the church of England. But every member of this church ſhould ſee, within as ſhort a compaſs as may be, how the ſame cauſe (allowing for the difference of times and faſhions) is maintained now.

A worthy divine diſtinguiſhed himſelf ſome forty years ago, in Three Letters to a Gentleman diſſenting from the Church of England; which letters were much attended to at the time, and procured the author the notice and encouragement of Archbiſhop Secker. He afterwards reduced the ſubſtance of them into a ſmall manual, addreſſed to a Diſſenting pariſhioner, with the pious deſire of guiding him to the Church of England: and an excellent little piece it is. But as the zeal of our Diſſenters permits nothing of this kind to paſs, without the appearance of an anſwer, it is probable they ſet one of their beſt hands upon the work of writing a ſhort reply to it; that the Diſſenting pariſhioner might not be guided to the church of England. This reply, which was printed at Birmingham, I have, with ſome difficulty, procured; and I ſhall produce, in their order, ſuch arguments as I have found in it; from which it will be ſeen, how the Diſſenters of the preſent age defend their ſeparation,

1. They make very light of the ſin of ſchiſm, as a thing which has nothing frightful to wiſe people; although it be dreſſed up by us in a frightful form, to terrify the ignorant, and ſuch as are children in underſtanding.

Such is ſchiſm, when it is committed againſt us; but when it comes home to themſelves, they have entertained a very different opinion of it, and have carried the principle of unity as high as the moſt zealous of the church of England. Liberty of conſcience, when it operated againſt themſelves, was called, "curſed toleration, that hideous monſter toleration," in a book ſubſcribed by the miniſters of the province of London, Dec. 14, 1647 *. We are then agreed, that ſchiſm muſt be of pernicious conſequence, and that it is a grievous affliction to the Chriſtian ſociety; though we are not rightly agreed as to the objects of ſchiſm. If conſidered in itſelf, it is the oppoſite to St. Paul's virtue of charity; as any intelligent perſon may ſee, who reads the 13th chapter of the firſt epiſtle to the Corinthians, as a continuation of the 12th chapter. And if charity is the greateſt of all virtues, its contrary, which is ſchiſm, muſt be the greateſt of all ſins; therefore, we juſtly pray againſt it in the Litany. Whether the Diſſenters ever follow our example, is more than I know; though it can ſcarcely be expected that they ſhould pray againſt, while they continue in it, and think it hath nothing frightful to wiſe people. But if we may judge of it by its fruits, (and there is no better rule) what envy and hatred, what diſputings and railings, what cruelty and perſecution, what rebellion and ſacrilege, hath it not produced in this kingdom? And they who acted theſe things were ſo far from taking ſhame to themſelves, that they laid all the guilt of them upon the church, which they perſecuted and plundered! We ſhould be glad to forget theſe things, but that there are ſome amongſt us who delight in the memory of thoſe unhappy times, and chew all the murder and the miſchief of them over again, which is the caſe with the author of the Confeſſional, and

* See a Friendly Debate between a Conformiſt and a Non-conformiſt, Edit. 3. p. 76.

other

other writers of the ſame ſpirit. As to the corruption of doctrine, which follows upon ſchiſm, it was ſo apparent to the actors in the ſchiſm of the laſt century, that it forced from them, that teſtimony above-mentioned, againſt the curſed nature of toleration. Threeſcore different ſects, ſome holding monſtrous and blaſphemous opinions, roſe out of the Preſbyterians of that time. Now, to make light of all theſe things, as if ſchiſm, which is a root of bitterneſs, *i. e.* an active principle of miſchief in the mind, were but a ſlight offence, a mere ſcarecrow to wiſe people, is to deceive men, and bring their conſciences and ſouls into a fatal ſnare. Nay, it is not only to deceive them, ſimply, but with the very deception which brought death into the world. The tempter ſuggeſted to our firſt parents, that they ſhould not ſurely die; and that their apprehenſions of danger aroſe from the ignorance and childiſhneſs of their underſtandings.

2. They plead next, that their ſchiſm, with reſpect to the church of England, is no more than a ſeparation from an human eſtabliſhment; for that the church of England has no foundation but upon the king and the parliament; whereas the church of Chriſt is founded upon the doctrines taught by the Apoſtles.

If our church has no foundation but upon the king and parliament, then certainly it is not founded upon the authority of Chriſt, and conſequently it is no church of Chriſt. But will any man ſay, that a national church, being a member of the catholic church of Chriſt, ceaſes to be ſuch, when adopted as a part of the conſtitution, and eſtabliſhed by the civil power? Suppoſe it were perſecuted by the civil power; and its miniſters and worſhip were proſcribed; would it therefore ceaſe to be a church of Chriſt? Certainly not: for the church of the Hebrews in Egypt, was ſtill the church of God, though the people were under a cruel edict not to ſerve him; and God owned it as ſuch, and delivered it at laſt. Do the powers of this world unmake the church by their reception of it, when they do not by their perſecuting of it? Do its biſhops and prieſts ceaſe to be biſhops and prieſts? Do its ſacraments ceaſe to be ſacraments?

Doth

Doth its diſcipline ceaſe to be Chriſtian diſcipline, and loſe its authority, becauſe the ſtate admits of it, and eſtabliſhes it? I ſay, ſuppoſe they were to declare againſt all theſe things, as the Heathens and Jews did in the firſt ages of the Goſpel, their declaration would ſignify nothing: becauſe the church, in its prieſthood and ſacraments, derives its authority only from Jeſus Chriſt, which the perſecution of the civil powers cannot reach; much leſs can their allowance turn it into an human authority, and render it of none effect. But we ſhall ſee hereafter, how all this is overthrown, by another plea which the Diſſenters (forgetting this) have made uſe of to defend their ſeparation from the church of England.

To ſay, that the church of Chriſt is founded upon the doctrines taught by the Apoſtles, is a groſs miſtake. Doctrines can no more confer authority of office to church miniſters, than the ſtatute book in England can make a juſtice of the peace; whoſe power muſt come to him by perſonal deputation. A written law does nothing, till there comes an executive power, lawfully ordained, to adminiſter and bring it to effect. Let any Diſſenter ſhew us the text or doctrine that will make a prieſt. We can ſoon ſhew him one which tells us how prieſts muſt be made.—"No "man taketh this honour to himſelf, but he that is called "of God, as was Aaron;" who was called by an outward conſecration, from a perſon whom God had commiſſioned to conſecrate: and the power thus given deſcended by ſucceſſion to his poſterity. The power of abſolution was given by Chriſt to the Chriſtian miniſtry, and without this power there can be no ſuch thing as a church of Chriſt. The prieſthood had the power of abſolution under the law of Moſes; and even the prieſts of Heatheniſm were never conſidered as the repreſentatives of the people, but of the God to whom they belong; to pronounce bleſſings, and forgive ſins in his name. But the Preſbyterians are ſo far from claiming this power to themſelves, (though ſuppoſed to be in all the prieſts of the world) that they mock at it in us, and call it popery and juggling; and a church ſo rejecting

a power

a power eſſential to the nature of prieſthood, is in a ſtate of abjuration againſt its own exiſtence.

3. They ſay, the church of England hath impoſed ſuch articles of faith, as the Goſpel hath not impoſed; for which impoſition Chriſt hath given no authority.

This objection extends to every church upon earth, that requires any articles of faith, as terms of church communion; and it proves too much if it proves any thing. The Goſpel, it is true, impoſes nothing but baptiſm and its faith in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt: all other articles are intended for the defence and ſecurity of this one in its proper extent. And ſuch articles will be more or leſs, according to times and occaſions, as the adverſaries of the faith aſſault it on different ſides, and with different principles of offence. The Goſpel does not require that we ſhould renounce the world, the fleſh, and the devil; nor ſet down the Apoſtles' creed, as a condition of communion: and, if we had a mind to be perverſe and captious, we might argue, that a man may come to Chriſtian baptiſm with his mouth ſhut, and not ſay one word for himſelf, becauſe the Goſpel hath not ſet down the form, nor ſpecified the terms of the baptiſmal covenant; though the intention or ſenſe of it (what we are to renounce, and what we are to believe) is clear throughout the New Teſtament. The church of England hath articles expreſsly againſt popery: but the Goſpel hath impoſed no ſuch articles; it knew nothing of popery; and the principle of the Diſſenters would leave us defenceleſs againſt the Papiſts, as well as all our other enemies, and is contrary to the fundamental principle of all ſociety, and even of nature itſelf. We have no occaſion here to enquire, what the articles of the church of England are; becauſe the objection extends to all articles whatſoever, except ſuch as are ſet down in the Scripture, which ſets down nothing but baptiſm; and is ſo brief in its accounts, that every true principle of the Chriſtian faith might be evaded, if we were to lay hold of ſome ſhort expreſſions, and make them excluſive, contrary to common rules of reaſoning, the plaineſt facts, and the nature of the caſe, as

ſome

ſome have done; particularly the celebrated Mr. Locke, who contends, that the Chriſtian Goſpel has but one article, namely, " that Jeſus Chriſt is the Meſſiah;" whereas the one great condition of ſalvation, in the Goſpel, is baptiſm in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt; therefore the great and fundamental article of the Goſpel, is that of faith in the Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt. It is plain the church was under ſome particular rules beſide the expreſſions of the New Teſtament, from the words of St. Paul, where he mentions the παραδοσεις, traditions or ordinances, delivered to the church of Corinth, to be religiouſly kept or obſerved. See 1 Cor. xi. 2.

4. From the preceding article, which aſſerts, that the church of England hath impoſed articles which Chriſt hath not impoſed; it is argued, that in oppoſing the church of England, they oppoſe " an invaſion of the kingly authority of Jeſus Chriſt."

Jeſus Chriſt doth not act in perſon, but hath commiſſioned his church to act for him, and hath promiſed to be with it, and ſupport its authority, to the end of the world. Therefore, to argue for Jeſus Chriſt againſt his church, is to ſet up Jeſus Chriſt againſt himſelf; and the like objection may be made againſt all the churches in the world: which, ſo far as they act for their own juſt rights, under Jeſus Chriſt, may be ſaid to act againſt him. Every true church is bound to aſſert and defend the faith it hath received: but its enemies will call this neceſſary defence an impoſition, and then contend, that they are free from all obligation. But with what grace doth this argument come from the party, who impoſed their own ſolemn league and covenant on men's conſciences in this kingdom, at the peril of their lives and fortunes, and proſcribed them as malignants if they refuſed to take it; for which there certainly is neither precedent nor precept in the Goſpel? How marvellouſly do the opinions of men change, when they argue for themſelves, and when they argue againſt us.

5. To explain away the offence of ſchiſm, it is farther argued, that as there were ſchiſms among the Corinthians, when

when it does not appear that there was any ſeparation; ſo there may be a ſeparation where there is no ſchiſm: becauſe Chriſtians may ſtill be united in heart and affection, though they perform the offices of religion in different places and in different ways.

The hiſtory of facts in this country give us a different proſpect of things; and indeed it is prepoſterous to ſuppoſe, that if we ſow in ſchiſm, we ſhall reap in unity: or in other words, that if we murder and mangle the body of the church, we ſhall preſerve charity, which is the life and ſoul of it. It is true, we ſhall not diſpute much about any thing, if we are indifferent to every thing: but miſguided religious zeal is not of this inſipid character. The ordinance of parliament of the 11th of Aug. 1645, for putting in execution the directory, has theſe words.—"If any perſon or perſons whatſoever, ſhall, at any time or times hereafter, uſe, or cauſe the aforeſaid Book of Common Prayer to be uſed in any church, chapel, or public place of worſhip, or in any private place, or family, within the kingdom of England, or the dominion of Wales, or port and town of Berwick; every perſon ſo offending herein, ſhall, for the firſt offence, pay the ſum of five pounds of lawful Engliſh money; for the ſecond offence, ten pounds; and for the third, ſhall ſuffer one whole year's impriſonment, without bail or mainprize." This law was one of the fruits of ſchiſm; and there never was a law more ſevere and cruel. The king was then living, and the private worſhip of his family is not excepted. But theſe were days of religious madneſs; we know better now. So it is ſaid; but I fear with very little truth. What would not that perſecuting ſpirit do, if it had power, which is ſo conſpicuous in the Syllabus of Mr. Robinſon's Lectures, a Diſſenting teacher at Cambridge? How freſh is the remembrance (or ought to be) of the riots in London, which ſhook the kingdom, and brought us ſo nearly to ruin in a few days; all conducted by a fanatic Preſbyterian, with a rout of forty thouſand diſorderly people at his heels? And if the principles of fanaticiſm can perform ſuch wonders here, even in a man without

without learning, without parts, without morals, without ſenſe: how dreadful may their effects be upon a future occaſion! and who can tell how ſoon that occaſion may happen? eſpecially as Dr. Prieſtley, another Diſſenting teacher, is now threatening us with impending ruin, from himſelf and his party; who give us warning, that they have long been, and are now, conveying gunpowder under our foundation, to blow up the old rotten fabric of the church of England? But our Diſſenting apologiſts aſſure us, Chriſtians may ſtill be united in heart and affection, though they worſhip God in different places: and that there may be ſeparation without ſchiſm, as there was ſchiſm at Corinth without ſeparation. But theſe ſmaller ſchiſms of the Corinthians, which did not actually ſeparate them into different communions, were yet, according to the Apoſtle, very reprehenſible, and of bad tendency: therefore, actual ſeparation, being ſchiſm in the extreme, muſt be more reprehenſible. To ſuppoſe it leſs, is to contradict the reaſon of things; as if it ſhould be argued, that becauſe we may hurt a man without killing him, therefore we may kill a man without hurting him.

6. However, if there ſhould be any ſchiſm betwixt the church of England and the Diſſenters, they ſay the guilt of it is with the church, who will not "yield to weak brethren in things which are confeſſed to be indifferent and of ſmall moment."

With what propriety can things of ſmall moment be introduced, as objections to our communion, after it has been aſſerted, that the church of England is "no church of Chriſt?" If that objection be good, all things of ſmall moment are ſuperfluous. For who can be obliged, or who indeed will conſent, to be a member of a church, which is no church of Chriſt? "Leave things indifferent (ſaith this reply) as they are in their own nature, and as Chriſt hath left them, and the ſeparation is over." So then, if theſe indifferent things were removed, the Diſſenters would communicate with a church, which is no church of Chriſt! Who can believe this? Is it not much more probable, that the

the Diſſenters do not mean to throw up the ſeparation for any conceſſions that can be made by a church, which, in their opinion, is itſelf ſeparated from the communion of Jeſus Chriſt? Theſe objections are ſo inconſiſtent, that they leave ſmall hopes of the poſſibility of a reconciliation. For if all theſe ſmall things were removed, ſtill there will remain the inſuperable (and we truſt, uncharitable and groundleſs) objection, that the church of England is no church of Chriſt; and that Diſſenters cannot upon any principle communicate with a falſe church. The caſe between us is very bad under this repreſentation of it; but it becomes, if poſſible, more hopeleſs in what follows.

7. For the Reply tells us, that the Diſſenters do not ſtand out for the value of the things required, which are matters of indifference; but ſtand up in defence of that liberty, wherewith Chriſt hath made them free, and will not be brought into bondage.

Do they think then, that Chriſt hath given them liberty to break the peace of the church, for matters indifferent? That is, to deſtroy peace, eſſential to ſalvation; to ſave liberty, the creature of human pride? Another apologiſt of the Diſſenters, the author of The Independent Whig, puts this matter out of queſtion; and affirms without reſerve, that ſchiſm is ſo neceſſary to the preſervation of liberty, that there can be "no liberty without ſchiſm." What would the Chriſtian world be, if this principle were univerſally followed? No two of us could conſent together; becauſe the one muſt loſe his liberty, till he goes off into ſchiſm; ſo it would break all Chriſtian ſocieties into individuals. Liberty and bondage are words of ſtrange ſignifications in this land, which it would be tedious to diſplay. Only let us diſtinguiſh, that there is no bondage in dutiful ſubmiſſion; for that is the ſervice of God which is perfect freedom: nor any liberty in unreaſonable diſobedience; for that is the bondage of Satan, who works in the children of diſobedience, and puts them to a great deal of trouble; making them reſtleſs and impatient, and leading them ſuch a wearieſome

ſome life, that, if it were not called liberty, they would wiſh themſelves out of the world.

8. The church of England is accuſed of taking away the bread and the cup, unleſs people will receive kneeling; and Chriſt hath not made kneeling a neceſſary term of communion.

Nor is it neceſſary with us; becauſe we adminiſter the ſacrament to the ſick or the infirm, either ſitting, kneeling, or lying. Kneeling is proper to an act of devotion; ſuch the ſacrament of the Lord's ſupper is now, and not a ſocial act of eating, as at the paſſover, when it was firſt inſtituted. Kneeling may admit of a bad conſtruction, becauſe the Papiſts kneel and worſhip the hoſt: but charity will give it a good conſtruction, and then all the difficulty is over. However, let us call it an impoſition: yet why ſhould the enjoining of it be objected to by the very people, who impoſed on all that took their ſolemn league and covenant, the poſture of ſtanding, with the ceremony of lifting up the right hand bare? But, what is ſtill more to the purpoſe, one of their apologiſts aſſures us, they make no ſcruple of giving their ſacrament to all thoſe who chuſe to kneel in a meeting-houſe *. Therefore it is not the thing, (though that is ſometimes highly exclaimed againſt) but the enjoining of the thing that renders it offenſive: and it appears from this caſe, that Diſſenters will do that to pleaſe themſelves, which they will not do to pleaſe God; who hath enjoined us all to be at peace with one another, and to agree in his worſhip.

Sponſors in baptiſm, and the ſignature of the croſs, are objected to. But the firſt is only a prudent proviſion, as a farther ſecurity for the child, if the parents ſhould die, or be of ſuch characters as renders them unfit for ſponſors; which the child cannot help. The ſignature of the croſs

* "In ſome of our churches, there are ſome who receive ſtanding, ſome kneeling.—Nor is there, I believe, amongſt our miniſters, one in five hundred, who would refuſe to give the ſacrament either ſtanding or kneeling, to any one who thought either of theſe the fitteſt poſture of receiving." Diſſenting Gentleman's Anſwer to the Rev. Mr. White's Three Letters, p. 21.

can give no offence (as one ſhould think) to any perſon who delights in the memory of the croſs itſelf. The pureſt ages of the church uſed it on all occaſions, particularly in exorciſms, which were antiently a part of baptiſm; and there are ſome pretty clear intimations in the Scripture for the uſe of ſome ſignature on the forehead; and the firſt of all ſignatures is that of the croſs. For motives of worldly traffic, the Dutch, inſtead of preferring it to a place in their foreheads, trample it under their feet: and our Diſſenters reject it from an affection to their ſchiſm. If the Papiſts are ſuperabundant and ſuperſtitious in the uſe of the croſs, what is that to us? If they repeat the Lord's prayer twenty times in an hour, are we not to repeat it at all *?

9. It is farther objected to our church, that the people have a right, an unalienable right, to chuſe their own miniſters; which with us they are not permitted to do.

As for the patriotic term unalienable, it is applied to the rights of nature, which are unalienable becauſe they are inherent. But here, it can only mean, that the Diſſenters claim it, and are reſolved not to part with it. On this part of the ſubject, I muſt lament with tears in my eyes, the great abuſes in the church of England, in reſpect to patronage and admiſſion into church-livings. But in bad times, no regulations are ſufficient to ſecure us from corruption; and even the very means appointed to keep out bad men, will let them in: for there are times, when perſons of no conſcience or character may act with impunity; and the worſt of men are the moſt ready to play with all religious ſecurities. That this caſe would be mended, if the choice of miniſters were always with the people, is by no means clear. For nothing is ſo common as for people to be divided in intereſts and affections on very unworthy motives; and thence many great and ſcandalous diſturbances ariſe; and a pariſh is ſo divided into parties, that perhaps they do not come into humour again for ſome years.

* See the uſe of the Signature of the Croſs in Baptiſm, fully and learnedly vindicated in Bennet's Abridgment of the London Caſes, chap. vi.

Beſides; ſuppoſe a Socinian ſhould have got poſſeſſion of a pulpit, and preached the people (or a few of the moſt active, noiſy and cunning, who overbear all the reſt) into hereſy: whom would they chuſe, but a Socinian, at the next vacancy? And would it not be much better that an orthodox miniſter ſhould be put upon them? If the people have this right, then all the people have it; and conſequently, a Socinian congregation have a right to chuſe a Socinian miniſter. How the Scripture hath been handled, as to this affair of popular election, was noted in the poſtſcript to the Eſſay on the church.

10. Though the Diſſenters have no miniſtry by ſucceſſion, they make light of this defect, and think they are as well off as we are, becauſe they ſay, our "right of ordaining came down to us through the channel of popery."

Biſhops, prieſts, and deacons, in a church, were no invention of popery, nor is our ſucceſſion any more affected by popery, than the Apoſtles' creed, which is alſo come down to us through the channel of popery; and ſo is the canon of the Scripture itſelf: yet we take the old creed and the old Scriptures, and think them as good as ever. The church of Rome is under ſuch an opprobrium with Proteſtants, that it is a convenient bugbear, brought forward upon all occaſions by thoſe who want better argument, to frighten us out of our church principles, and cover the weakneſs of their own innovations. But the ſucceſſion of church offices is no more affected by the errors of popery, than a man's pedigree is affected by his bodily diſtemper, or the diſtempers of his parents; and if the man, by alteratives and reſtoratives, is cured with the bleſſing of God, he returns to the ſtate of his purer anceſtors of a remote generation. A ſelf-originated upſtart, who has been railing at him for things paſt, in which he had no ſhare, may take his name, and claim his inheritance; but when his title comes to be examined, the true right will appear, and juſtice will take place.

If we trace the pedigree of the church of England far enough backwards, we find a Chriſtian church of the epiſcopal

copal form in Britain, with an independent right and authority of its own, before Auſtin ſet his foot in the country, as the meſſenger of Rome. At the reformation, this church did but return to its original rights, with an epiſcopacy independent of the Pope, and enjoyed it for ſome years, with the general approbation of the people, and there was no ſuch thing as a Preſbyterian in the nation. It was approved and congratulated for its felicity by the reformed of other countries: and even Calvin and Beza then little thought that they ſhould have any followers ſo mad (I uſe their own word) as to reject ſuch an epiſcopacy as ours, which had freed itſelf from the uſurpation of the papacy. Calvin, in his Epiſtle to Cardinal Sadolet, ſaid of thoſe who ſhould reject ſuch an hierarchy, that he ſhould think them *nullo non anathemate dignos*, i. e. "that no curſe could be too bad for them." Beza would not believe that any could reject the order of biſhops in a reformed church. "If there be ſuch," ſaid he, "God forbid that any man in his wits ſhould aſſent to the madneſs of thoſe men *." And in the ſame book †, ſpeaking of the hierarchy of England and her biſhops, he ſays, "Let her enjoy that ſingular bleſſing of God, which I wiſh may be perpetual to her." Such at that time were the ſentiments of Beza and Calvin, who afterwards found it convenient to change their ſtyle; and, when the war was carried on againſt epiſcopacy itſelf, the expurgatorial authority of their editors in later editions expunged thoſe charitable atteſtations out of their works; which hath a very guilty appearance.

11. The Diſſenters plead, that what is called the act of toleration, has given a ſanction to their ſeparation, and taken away the ſin of it. They are "not chargeable with ſchiſm, ſince they who have the power of continuing or altering our church at their pleaſure, have given them liberty to withdraw, and have taken their places of worſhip under their protection as well as ours."

* Ad Tract. de Miniſt. Evang. ab Hadr. Sarav. Edit. Belgo. c. 1.

† Cap. 18.

If I underſtand this plea right, it is a mill-ſtone about the neck of all the reſt; becauſe it ſhews, that the apologiſt of the Diſſenters hath argued without principles, and ſo hath fallen into a manifeſt contradiction. He began with mocking at the church of England, as having no foundation but upon the king and parliament: or, as another Diſſenter hath expreſſed it, in the like inſulting ſtrain, as "built upon the foundation of the lords and commons, the king himſelf being the chief corner-ſtone." And they have argued, that it even ceaſes to be a church of Chriſt, becauſe it acts under the allowance of the civil power. Yet in their own caſe, the king and parliament, by an act of grace, can make ſchiſm to be no ſchiſm! The protection we have from the civil government is caſt in our teeth, as a diſadvantage, which extends even to the unchurching of us, and throwing us out of the kingdom of Chriſt; but the ſame thing (ſuppoſing them to have it) takes away from them the guilt of their ſeparation! And thus they give to the king and parliament the privilege of God himſelf, who only can forgive ſin: which is more than we ever allowed them.

It is a very falſe ſuggeſtion, that our civil government can alter the church at their pleaſure. There is, indeed, a ſenſe, in which it may be ſaid, that a man has power to do whatever he can do by force and violence: but ſtill there is an eſſential difference between the power of force, and the power of right and authority. The church of England never can be altered legally, without the conſent and act of the convocation, who are a part of the conſtitution: and if it were otherwiſe done, it muſt be done by an act of violence, againſt the rights of Engliſhmen; for Engliſhmen do not loſe their rights by being Chriſtians and churchmen, as their enemies are inclined to have it. There can be no power of authority in laymen to make or unmake a church, any more than there can be a power in the church to make or unmake the civil conſtitution; and nothing can confound theſe powers but an overbearing principle of infidelity, from which may God deliver us; who hath promiſed that the gates of hell (the judicial power of the adverſaries of

Jeſus

Jeſus Chriſt) ſhall not prevail againſt us. Suppoſe the civil power ſhould make an act that the king ſhall ordain prieſts, or that prieſts ſhall not baptize children, nor conſecrate the ſacrament; what would ſuch an act ſignify? Therefore, they have not the power to alter the church at their pleaſure; for this might be their pleaſure, if their wits, or the grace of God, were to forſake them. Such a power, if it were claimed, was never exerciſed even by Heathen perſecutors. However, the Diſſenters do not ſeem unwilling that ſuch a tyrannical power ſhould be exerciſed, and appear to reliſh the idea of it, if it be but turned againſt the church of England. No one ſpiritual act can be exerciſed, nor is it claimed by the civil power in this country; which can neither baptize, nor ordain, nor abſolve, nor conſecrate, nor excommunicate; although the Diſſenters, in the heat of their zeal, have given the ſtate a ſpiritual power, and even more, over us, and themſelves too. But the ſtate can ſay, who ſhall or ſhall not partake of temporalities: and this every ſtate will ſay, ſome more, ſome leſs, as long as the church accepts of their protection, and enjoys a legal maintenance and ſupport under them. Worldly politics in ſuch a caſe will be ſure to interfere, and abuſes will ariſe. Churchmen will be apt to accommodate themſelves to the views and inclinations of the ſtate, or ſome of the acting members of the ſtate, who are their friends: their doctrines will change with the times; their conſciences will become too flexible and eaſy, and the people whom they teach will be in danger from them. There is no convenience in this world without its inconvenience. When the ſtate was ſchiſmatical in the days of the grand uſurpation, the church of that time could find no ſuch ſin as ſacrilege in the Scripture, for the fear of giving offence to their patrons, who were deep in the guilt of it: and the aſſembly of divines (as it was remarked long ago by Biſhop Patrick) avoided all mention of it in their annotations.

12. The Diſſenters hold themſelves blameleſs, becauſe many perſons of the church of England, and ſome of great

and popular character, have juſtified and even applauded their ſeparation.

I find great ſtreſs laid upon this circumſtance, which is blazoned out with pompous words and ſplendid quotations, as well of what hath been ſpoken (or ſo reported) as written. But the fear or favour of men, eſpecially of men too attentive to the intereſts of this world, (as ſome of their friends have certainly been) is a very unſound bottom for the Diſſenters to reſt upon; and ſo they eſteem it themſelves, when it is on our ſide. But if any falſe brethren amongſt us take part with them, all ſuch are excellent men, ornaments of the eſtabliſhment, and of unanſwerable authority. Sometimes the Diſſenters are all for the Scripture; Jeſus Chriſt is their only king, and to him they appeal for the rectitude of their proceedings; but if they find a flatterer amongſt us, they make the moſt of him: and ſome ſuch are always to be found; for all are not Iſrael that are of Iſrael; and it doth not follow, that a man muſt be true to the church of England, becauſe it hath introduced him to a ſeat in the houſe of lords. Temporal conſiderations bring ſome men into the church, whoſe hearts and affections never were, nor ever will be with it. Of ſuch no honeſt man can approve: and therefore the approbation of ſuch, with all their teſtimonies and certificates, is but of little value at laſt. Biſhop Hoadley was of this character: a Socinian in principle: who, while he was celebrated by the enemies of the church of England, (and perhaps aſſiſted towards his advancement) for having baniſhed all mitres and lordſhips, and ſpiritual courts, out of the kingdom of Chriſt, was, himſelf, an anſwer to every thing he had written; who ſcrupled not to adorn himſelf with a mitre and a lordſhip in one of the firſt preferments in this church; while he was a greater favourer of thoſe who were out of it, than of thoſe who were in it, unleſs they were in it upon his own principles.

Amongſt other bright ornaments of the church, who applaud the ſeparation of the Diſſenters, the authors of the Free and Candid Diſquiſitions are brought in. Theſe are

not

not only tender to the Diſſenters, but they rather think we ſhall never do well without them; that they are neceſſary to preſerve the virtue of the nation; to ſave our religious liberty; to prevent the return of ſlavery; and to ſerve as a check, leſt we ſhould caſt a favourable aſpect toward Rome. Theſe things are fairly ſaid, but not truly; and if we conſider a little farther from whence they came, little honour will accrue to the Diſſenters from the teſtimony of theſe authors. For it is by no means clear that they were members of our own church, though they moſt ſolemnly and repeatedly profeſſed themſelves ſo to be in their work. It was ſuſpected very early, that they were not ſuch as they called themſelves, but enemies under the diſguiſe of friends. Of this their work itſelf carries ſome internal marks, which ſeem to have eſcaped them unawares.—*Ficta cito ad naturam reciderint ſuam.* The author of Free and impartial Conſiderations on the Free and candid Diſquiſitions, preſſed them with this, (Anno 1751) and with great appearance of reaſon. He told them farther, "It begins now to be reported, and I partly believe it, that an eminent Diſſenter, well known by his writings, has had a hand more or leſs in the Diſquiſitions *." But, ſome few years after, in 1758, when this ſecret had been ſearched a little farther, or had tranſpired of itſelf, I find an author, and I believe, a very honeſt one, aſſerting in the plaineſt terms, that thoſe authors were actually Diſſenters; and taxing the party very roundly with their prevarication, in theſe words: "Amidſt the greateſt indulgence, and in open defiance of the laws, they impugned and libelled our liturgy, and our conſtitution—without the leaſt proof or foundation: they charged our liturgy with all the defects, with all the faults, improprieties, and corruptions, which had been ſuggeſted by Papiſts, Heretics, Enthuſiaſts, and the moſt inveterate enemies of our conſtitution. And for fear the people ſhould ſay that an enemy had done this, they, by the moſt ſolemn and repeated inſinuations, declared themſelves to be true and dutiful ſons of the

* Page 59.

eſtabliſhed church *." If, after ſuch profeſſions, theſe writers were Diſſenters, their Diſquiſitions exhibit ſuch a ſcene of treachery, prevarication, ſelf-adulation, and ingratitude, to the government under which, and the eſtabliſhed church with which they live, as is ſcarcely to be paralleled in hiſtory.

On this ſuppoſition, all the fine things thoſe authors thought fit to ſay of the Diſſenters, and their virtues, and the nature and merits of their ſeparation, are of no authority; for, that Diſſenters ſhould praiſe Diſſenters, is nothing wonderful; but, if Diſſenters did this, under the name of true and dutiful ſons of the church, then ſuch praiſe is againſt them in every word of it. What ſort of principles they muſt be, which can reconcile men's conſciences to ſuch jeſuitical frauds and diſguiſes, they who practiſe them are bound to conſider.

If the Diſſenters think they can juſtify their ſeparation by the praiſe of men, let them proceed fairly, and take it, ſuch as it is, all together. They ſhould remember, and eſtimate properly, how much of it comes from the bench of our biſhops, and how much from the ſeat of the ſcornful: how univerſally they are befriended and admired by Deiſts, free-thinkers, Socinian philoſophers, and looſe-livers; who delighting to ſee the church oppoſed, and Chriſtian people divided, are exactly of the ſame opinion with ſome of thoſe great ornaments of the eſtabliſhment of whoſe teſtimony our apologiſt hath ſo loudly boaſted. "I heartily thank God," ſays the author of The Independent Whig, "that we have Diſſenters, and I hope we ſhall never be without them †."

13. The laſt and the moſt general argument on which the Diſſenters depend, and which, if it were juſt, would render all other arguments ſuperfluous, is this; that all men "have a right to judge and chuſe for themſelves in matters of religion."

* Caſe of the Royal Martyr conſidered with candour, p. 333, 334.

† Vol. iii. p. 223.

This

This is an extenſive principle, which juſtifies all ſects, and ſuperſedes all inſtitutions and ſacraments whatſoever. It alſo ſhews the Diſſenters of this day, who have recourſe to it, to be quite a different claſs of men from the Puritans in the days of Elizabeth; for here they extend their claims from ſchiſm up to hereſy, and beyond it, even into the privileges and immunities of infidelity itſelf. The Puritans formerly judged againſt us in our diſcipline; but the Diſſenters and their friends now judge againſt us in our doctrines. For thus ſaith the author of the Independent Whig, another apologiſt of the Diſſenters:—"No man ought to pay any ſubmiſſion to that doctrine or diſcipline which he does not like:" and the war, which was once carried on againſt prelacy and ceremonies, is now turned againſt articles and creeds.

If the Diſſenters at large have this right of chuſing what they like, and rejecting what they diſlike, then the Quakers have it: and why not the Jews and the Mahometans? For I deſire to know what there is betwixt us and them, but matters of religion?

As to this affair of chuſing, eſpecially in matters of religion, there are ſtrange examples of human perverſeneſs and wickedneſs. How often did the people chuſe new gods? Hereſy is ſo called, becauſe it is a doctrine which a man doth not receive, but chuſe for himſelf; and if his choice is of right, there can be no ſuch thing as hereſy in the world. But hereſy is reckoned among the works of the fleſh; and they that heap up teachers to themſelves, are ſaid to do it of their own luſts. Thus every caſe becomes deſperate: for luſt being an irrational, brutal principle, hears no reaſon; and nothing but diſorder and confuſion can follow, when this principle takes the lead in religion. When men took wives of ſuch as they choſe, and had no rule but this rule of choice; the earth was ſoon filled with violence: and if men may take what they chuſe in religion, ſects and diviſions, ſtrife and envying, rebellion and ſacrilege, without end, muſt be the conſequence; and ſo it is already recorded in the annals of this kingdom.

POST-

POSTSCRIPT.

AN ACCOUNT OF THE FIRST SEPARATION OF THE DISSENTERS FROM THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

THE preceding ſhort View of the Argument betwixt the Church and the Diſſenters, having brought the authors of Free and Candid Diſquiſitions on the Liturgy of the Church of England under our conſideration, I cannot help mentioning on this occaſion, that I have a manuſcript in my poſſeſſion of ſeventy-two ſheets, containing remarks on that work, written immediately after its publication, by one of the firſt ſcholars, and beſt divines of this century.

The public never did, and probably never will, receive any information from theſe papers; but to me they have been very entertaining and inſtructive. In one of the author's notes upon a large quotation from the epiſtles of St. Cyprian, I find the following account of the riſe and progreſs of the ſchiſm, which hath troubled the ſtate of the church, more or leſs, ever ſince the reformation; and as this little work may fall into the hands of ſome readers, who never heard whether our Diſſenters originally divided from us, or we from them, it may be uſeful to ſhew how the caſe ſtands. The fact is this; they went out from us, after the full eſtabliſhment of this church.

"For, in the year 1548, 2 Ed. 6. the archbiſhop of Canterbury, and twelve of the other principal biſhops and divines, joined in a committee, drew up the form of celebrating the Lord's ſupper; and, after that, of the reſt of the common prayer, chiefly from the beſt primitive formularies of public prayer they could find; which was ſoon after confirmed by authority of parliament, with this teſtimony ſubjoined, viz. that "none could doubt but that the authors were inſpired, and aſſiſted therein by the Holy Ghoſt."

At

At the ſame time (as Nichols, in his Defenſio Eccleſiæ Anglicanæ, obſerves) it was the peculiar happineſs of our reformation, that as it had been eſtabliſhed by the concurrent authority of the church and ſtate, ſo we enjoyed the moſt perfect agreement and unanimity of all orders of men among us; the very name of thoſe ſwarms of ſectariſts (the filthy pollutions whereof have, ſince, infected ſo far and wide) being then not ſo much as heard of in our land. Neither did any one, either at home or abroad, (the envy, ill-nature, and heterodoxy of Calvin, only excepted) charge us, in the leaſt, with any remains of popiſh leaven, as mixt with our ſervices and orders, or any thing that looked that way: but all men honoured our church, as the moſt holy mother of the people of God committed to her, as well as the moſt ſtrenuous oppoſer of antichriſt, and the chief bulwark of the reformation. And ſo matters continued; not a dog moving his tongue, or ſowing the leaſt ſeed of ſchiſm, or diſſention, to corrupt her: till under the perſecution in queen Mary's time, when many flying (as it was to be expected) into the Proteſtant ſtates abroad, there ſettled themſelves into little chapelries, or churches, by permiſſion of the magiſtrates, according to the order of the common prayer, and ſervice of the church of England. Only, at Frankfort, one Fox, a man of a turbulent innovating ſpirit, with others aſſociated to him, were drawn into fondneſs for Calvin's plan, (ſchiſmatical, as it was, from all Chriſtian churches ſince the Apoſtles) and made themſelves a new farrago of public prayers, as oppoſite to the Engliſh, and conſequently to thoſe of all the primitive churches, as they could deviſe: which, upon queen Mary's death, they brought home with them; and, in preaching and writing, endeavoured to force, or palm upon the people, but yet without any direct and open ſchiſm; till one Cartwright, in a theological diſputation held at Cambridge before the queen, [Elizabeth] being rebuked by her for his unreaſonable and turbulent manner of conducting himſelf in it, thereupon went off, full fraught with ſpleen and ſpite, to Calvin: from whence returning, with new ulcers added to his old ſores,

and

and cauſing freſh diſturbances, he was expelled his college, and deprived of the Margaret profeſſorſhip, by Dr. Whitgift, who was head of the ſame college, [Trinity] and vice-chancellor of the univerſity. Whereupon, with others of his own Calviniſtical caſt, he began to ſet up his novo-puritanical ſchiſm, with claſſes, conventicles, &c. in avowed contempt, and rebellion againſt the church. The ſmoking brands of which fire of ſchiſm being blown up by the tainted breath of his followers, broke out, in half an age, into a flame that once ſet three kingdoms into a blaze, brought one of the beſt of kings to the block, extirpated epiſcopacy, and the peerage, ſo as without the viſible interpoſition of Providence, there appeared no more hopes of their reſtoration for ever. Neither are the coals of the old brands yet quenched, but they burn ſtill under the embers of ſedition, wherewith they are raked up, and threaten yet new and worſe fires, perhaps to the civil, but certainly to the religious ſtate of things among us; which God avert!"

This good man did not live to ſee the diſmembering of the Britiſh empire, by the ſeparation of the American colonies, begun and carried on by the ſame party both here and there, to the loſs of ſo many thouſand lives, and the oppreſſing of the people with new and endleſs burthens of taxes. So notorious was the caſe, that even the gentlemen of the army, who had an opportunity of making proper obſervations, and were properly diſpoſed to make them, brought home this report with them to the mother country, that if the church of England had but obtained that timely ſupport in the colonies, for which it had ſo often petitioned, the American rebellion had never happened: and if this government ſhall be as remiſs toward itſelf, in the mother country, as it has been towards the colonies, the ſame evils will ſoon break out at home.

AN

ACCOUNT

OF

REASON AND FAITH:

IN RELATION TO THE

MYSTERIES OF CHRISTIANITY.

By JOHN NORRIS, M.A.

RECTOR OF BEMERTON, NEAR SARUM.

AN

AN ACCOUNT OF REASON AND FAITH, &c.

CHAP. X.

THE CONCLUSION OF THE WHOLE, WITH AN ADDRESS TO THE SOCINIANS.

1. AND thus I have led my reader through a long courſe of various reaſoning, and perhaps as far as he is willing to follow me, though I hope his journey has not been without ſome pleaſure that may deceive, and ſome profit that may in part reward the labour of it. I have ſhewn him what reaſon is, and what faith is, that ſo he may ſee from the abſolute natures of each what habitude and relation they have to one another, and how the darkneſs and obſcurity of the latter may conſiſt with the light and evidence of the former. I have alſo conſidered the diſtinction of things above reaſon and things contrary to reaſon, and ſhewn it to be real and well grounded, and to have all that is requiſite to a good diſtinction. And for the further confirmation of it, I have alſo ſhewn that human reaſon is not the meaſure of truth. From which great principle (which I was the more willing to diſcourſe at large and thoroughly to ſettle and eſtabliſh becauſe of its moment and conſe-

quence to the concern in hand) I have deduced that weighty inference, that therefore the incomprehenſibility of a thing is no concluding argument of its not being true, which conſequence, for the greater ſecurity of it, becauſe it is ſo conſiderable in the preſent controverſy, I have alſo proved backwards, by ſhewing that if the incomprehenſibility of a thing were an argument of its not being true, then human reaſon (contrary to what was before demonſtrated) would be the meaſure of truth. Whence I infer again *ex abſurdo*, that therefore the incomprehenſibility of a thing is no argument of its not being true. From this laſt conſequence I infer another of no leſs moment and conſideration, viz. That therefore the incomprehenſibility of a thing is no argument againſt the belief of it neither, where alſo I conſider that ſeemingly oppoſite maxim of Des Cartes, that we are to aſſent to nothing but what is clear and evident, and reconcile it to the other poſition. Whence my next ſtep was to ſtate the true uſe of reaſon in believing, which I ſhewed to conſiſt not in examining the credibility of the object, but in taking account of the certainty of the revelation, which when once reſolved of we are no longer to diſpute, but believe. In fine, I have made an application of theſe conſiderations to the myſteries of the Chriſtian faith, by ſhewing that they are never the leſs to be believed for being myſteries, ſuppoſing them otherwiſe ſufficiently revealed, againſt which alſo I have ſhewn their incomprehenſibility to be no objection. So that every way the great argument againſt the myſteries of the Chriſtian faith taken from the incomprehenſibility of them vaniſhes and ſinks into nothing. In all which I think I have effectually overthrown the general and fundamental ground of Socinianiſm, and truly in great meaſure that of Deiſm too, whoſe beſt argument againſt revealed religion in general, is, becauſe the Chriſtian, upon all accounts the moſt preferable of thoſe that pretend to be revealed, contains ſo many things in it which tranſcend the comprehenſion of human underſtanding. But whether this beſt argument be really a good one or no, the whole procedure of this diſcourſe may ſufficiently ſhew, and whoever

knows how to diſtinguiſh ſophiſtry from good reaſoning, may eaſily judge.

2. And now you gentlemen for whoſe ſakes I have been at the pains to write this treatiſe, give me leave in a few words to addreſs myſelf a little more particularly to you, and to expoſtulate with you. Whether it be the good opinion you have of your cauſe, or the preſent opportunity you have to appear in the behalf of it that invites you ſo freely to come abroad as you have done of late, you have certainly (to give your courage its due) taken a very rational and polite age for it, and I hope the wiſe conduct of Providence may turn this juncture to the advantage of the truth, and that the light to which you have adventured to expoſe your novel opinions may ſerve to make you ſee their abſurdities, if you do not too obſtinately ſhut your eyes againſt it. Some of you are conſiderable maſters of reaſon (otherwiſe truly I ſhould not think it worth while to argue with you) and you all profeſs great devotion to it (I wiſh you do not make it an idol) and to be very zealous and affectionate diſciples of it. Reaſon is the great meaſure by which you pretend to go, and the judge to whom in all things you appeal. Now I accept of your meaſure, and do not refuſe to be tried in the court of your own chooſing. Accordingly you ſee I have dealt with you all along upon the ground of logic, and in a rational way, being very confident that reaſon alone will diſcover to you your undue elevations of it, and the errors you have been miſled into by that occaſion, if you do but conſult even this oracle of yours as you ought, and make a right uſe of its ſacred light.

3. But I am afraid you do not. Inſtead of employing your reaſon in the firſt place to examine the certainty of the revelation, whether ſuch a thing be truly revealed, and if ſo, to believe it notwithſtanding its being incomprehenſible, your method is to begin with the quality of the object, to conſider whether it be comprehenſible or no, and accordingly to proceed in your belief or diſbelief of its being revealed. It is true indeed you are not ſo groſs as to argue thus, this is comprehenſible therefore it is revealed. But you cannot

deny but that you argue thus, this is incomprehenſible, therefore it is not revealed, proceeding upon this general principle, that though whatever is comprehenſible is not therefore preſently revealed, yet whatever is revealed muſt be comprehenſible. But now judge you whether this be not to make your reaſon the rule and meaſure of divine revelation, that is, that God can reveal nothing to you but what you can comprehend, or, that you are able to comprehend all that God can poſſibly reveal (for otherwiſe how is your not being able to comprehend any thing an argument of its not being revealed) I ſay conſider whether this be not to ſet up your reaſon as the rule of revelation, and conſider again whether this does not reſolve either into a very low opinion you have of God and his infinite perfections, or an extravagantly high one you have of yourſelves and your own rational endowments.

4. And yet as if this were not preſumption enough, do you not alſo make your reaſon the rule of faith, as well as of revelation? To be the rule of faith is a very great thing, and yet ſo far it is plain that you make your reaſon the rule of faith, that you will allow nothing to be believed but whoſe bottom you can ſound by that line; this being an avowed principle with you that you are to believe nothing but what you can comprehend. But hold a little, before your reaſon can be the meaſure of faith, muſt it not be the meaſure of truth? And I pray conſider ſeriouſly, and tell me truly, do you verily think in your conſciences that your reaſon is the meaſure of truth? Do you think your rational faculties proportioned to every intelligible object, and that you are able to comprehend all the things that are, and that there is nothing in the whole extent of ſcience too high, too difficult, or too abſtruſe for you; no one part of this vaſt intellectual ſea but what you can wade through? If you ſay yes, beſides the blaſphemous preſumption and luciferian arrogance of the aſſertion, and how little it falls on this ſide of *ſimilis ero altiſſimo*, which baniſhed the vain-glorious angel from the court of heaven, becauſe nothing leſs would content his aſpiring ambition than to be as God there (though by

by the way there is more ſenſe and congruity of reaſon in pretending to be a God in heaven, than to be a God upon earth) I ſay beſides this, I would put it to your more ſober thought to conſider whether it be not every whit as great an extremity in the way of rational ſpeculation to dogmatize ſo far as to pretend to comprehend every thing, as to ſay with the Sceptics and Phyrrhonians that we know nothing: the latter of which however in regard of its moral conſequences may be more innocently and ſafely affirmed than the former, ſince in that we only humbly degrade ourſelves, and are content to ſink down into the level of brutes, whereas in this we aſpire to what is infinitely above us, and advance ourſelves into the ſeat of God. And you know an exceſs of ſelf-dejection is of the two the more tolerable extreme. But if you ſay that your reaſon is not the meaſure of truth (as upon this, and the other conſiderations there lies a neceſſity upon you to confeſs) how then I pray comes it to be the meaſure of your faith, and how come you to lay down this for a maxim, that you will believe nothing but what you can comprehend? Why, if your reaſon be not the meaſure of truth (and you yourſelves care not, and I believe are aſhamed in terms to ſay that it is) then do you not evidently diſcern that there is no conſequence from the incomprehenſibility of a thing to the incredibility of it, and that you have no reaſon to deny your belief to a thing as true, merely upon the account of its incomprehenſibility. And do you not then plainly ſee that your great maxim falls to the ground, that you are to believe nothing but what you can comprehend? But if yet, notwithſtanding this, you will ſtill adhere to your beloved maxim, and reſolve to believe nothing but what you can adjuſt and clear up to your reaſon, then I pray conſider whether this will not neceſſarily lead you back to that abſurd, and withal odious and invidious principle, and which therefore you yourſelves care not to own, viz. That your reaſon is the meaſure of truth.

5. But why do you not care to own it? Do you not ſee at the firſt caſt of your eye that you are unavoidably driven upon it by your profeſſed maxim? Or if you do not think

fit to own it (as indeed it is a good handſome morſel to ſwallow) why do you not then renounce that maxim of yours which is the immediate conſequence of it, and neceſſarily reſolves into it? Why will you, whoſe pretenſions are ſo high to reaſon, act ſo directly againſt the laws of it, as to own that, implicitly and by conſequence, which neither your head nor your heart will ſerve you to acknowledge in broad and expreſs terms? Be a little more conſiſtent with your own ſentiments at leaſt, if not with truth, and be not yourſelves a myſtery, while you pretend not to believe any. If you do not care to own the principle, then deny the conſequence, or if you will not let go the conſequence, then ſtand by and own the principle. Either ſpeak out boldly and roundly that your reaſon is the meaſure of truth, or if you think that too groſs a defiance to ſenſe, experience, religion and reaſon too to be profeſſedly maintained, then be ſo ingenuous to us, and ſo conſiſtent with yourſelves, as to renounce your maxim of believing nothing but what you can comprehend, ſince you cannot hold it but with that abſurd principle; and which is therefore a certain argument that you ought not to hold it.

6. And are you ſure that you always do, I mean ſo as to act by it, that you hold it *in hypotheſi* as well as *in theſi*? Do you never aſſent to any thing but what you can comprehend? Are there not many things in the ſciences which you find a preſſing neceſſity to ſubſcribe to, though at the ſame time you cannot conceive their modus, or account for their poſſibility? But you will ſay perhaps theſe are things of a phyſical and philoſophical conſideration, and ſuch as have no relation to religion. True, they are ſo, but then beſides that this viſibly betrays the weakneſs of your ground, ſince if the incomprehenſibility of a thing were a good argument againſt aſſenting to the truth of it, it would be ſo throughout, in the things of nature, as well as in the things of religion: I would here further demand of you why you are ſo particularly ſhy of admitting incomprehenſible things in religion, why is it there only that you ſeem ſo ſtiffly and zealouſly to adhere to your maxim of believing nothing but

what

what you can comprehend? Since there are ſo many inconceivable things, or if you pleaſe, myſteries, in the works of nature and of Providence, why not in religion? Nay where ſhould one expect to find myſteries if not there, where all the things that are revealed are revealed by God himſelf, and many of them concerning himſelf and his own infinite perfections? And what deference do we pay to God more than man, if either we ſuppoſe that he cannot reveal truths to us which we cannot comprehend, or if we will not believe them if he does? Nay, may it not be rather ſaid that we do not pay him ſo much, ſince we think it adviſeable to receive many things from our tutors and maſters upon their authority only, though we do not comprehend them ourſelves; and juſtify our doing ſo by that well-known and in many caſes very reaſonable maxim, *diſcentem oportet credere.* But as there is no authority like the divine, ſo if that motto become any ſchool, it is that of Chriſt.

7. Now it is in this ſchool that you profeſs to be ſcholars, and why then will you be ſuch opiniative and uncompliant diſciples as to refuſe to receive the ſublime lectures read to you by your divine and infallible Maſter, merely becauſe they are too high for you, and you cannot conceive them, when at the ſame time any one of you that is not a mathematician (pardon the ſuppoſition) would, I doubt not, take it upon the word of him that is ſo, that the diameter of a ſquare is incommenſurable to the ſide, though he did not know how to demonſtrate, or ſo much as conceive it himſelf. Since then you would expreſs ſuch implicit regard to the authority of a fallible, though learned man, ſhall not the divine weigh infinitely heavier with you; and ſince you would not ſtick to aſſent to things above your conception in human and natural ſciences, why are you ſo violently ſet againſt myſteries in religion, whereof God is not only the author, but in great meaſure the object too.

8. You know very well that in the great problem of the diviſibility of quantity, there are incomprehenſibilities on both ſides, it being inconceivable that quantity ſhould, and it being alſo inconceivable that it ſhould not be divided infinitely. And yet you know again, that, as

being parts of a contradiction, one of them muſt neceſſarily be true. Poſſibly you may not be able with the utmoſt certainty, and without all heſitation, to determine which that is; but however you know in the general, that one of them, indeterminately, muſt be true; (which by the way is enough to convince you that the incomprehenſibility of a thing is no argument againſt the truth of it) and you muſt alſo further grant, that God, whoſe underſtanding is infinite, does preciſely and determinately know which of them is ſo. Now ſuppoſe God ſhould reveal this, and make it an article of faith. It is not indeed likely that he will, it being ſo much beneath the Majeſty, and beſides the end and intention of revelation, whoſe great deſign is the direction of our life and manners, and not the improvement of our ſpeculation. But ſuppoſe, I ſay, he ſhould, would you not believe it? If not, then you muſt ſuppoſe either that there is no neceſſity that either of the two parts (which yet are contradictory) ſhould be true, or that though one of them be true, yet that God does not know which is ſo, or that though he does know which is ſo, yet he does not deal faithfully in revealing that which is the right, all which are extravagant ſuppoſitions, and ſuch as men of your ſenſe and reaſon can never allow. But then if you ſay (as you muſt) that you would believe it, then I pray what becomes of your maxim of believing nothing but what you can comprehend, and why do you ſo ſtiffly plead the incomprehenſibility of an article of faith againſt the belief of it, and why muſt there be no myſteries in religion? I ſay in religion, where if any where our reaſon might expect to find things above its meaſure, unreachable heights, and unfathomable depths, and where God is not only the revealer (as in the caſe now ſuppoſed) but alſo the object revealed. For is it not reaſonable to ſuppoſe that there are things more incomprehenſible in God than in nature, and if you would receive an incomprehenſible revelation of his concerning his works, how much rather ought you to admit the ſame concerning himſelf?

9. And

9. And this gives me occaſion to ſay ſomething to you concerning the doctrine of the Holy Trinity. This great article of the Chriſtian faith you have a particular prejudice againſt, and will not believe, and that becauſe it ſo utterly tranſcends the force of reaſon to conceive how the ſame undivided and numerically One ſimple eſſence of God ſhould be communicated to Three really diſtinct Perſons, ſo as that there ſhould be both a Unity in Trinity, and a Trinity in Unity. This however, as inconceivable as it ſeems, ſome will not yield to be ſo far above reaſon but that a rational and intelligible account may be given of it, which accordingly they have eſſayed to do by ſeveral hypotheſes. But I decline at preſent all advantage that may be had from them, or any other that may be invented to render this an intelligible article. You know I reaſon all along upon the contrary ſuppoſition, that thoſe articles of the Chriſtian faith which we call myſteries, are really incomprehenſible, and only go to invalidate the conſequence that is drawn from thence in prejudice of their belief. Well then for once we will give you what you ſtand for, that the doctrine of the Trinity is indeed utterly above reaſon. You have our leave to ſuppoſe it as incomprehenſible as you pleaſe. But then you are to conſider (beſides what has hitherto been diſcourſed concerning the nullity of the conſequence from the incomprehenſibility of a thing to its incredibility) that this is a revelation of God concerning himſelf, and do you pretend to comprehend the nature and eſſence of God? If you do, then your underſtanding is as infinite as the divine. But if you do not, then the incomprehenſibility of this myſterious article ought to be no objection with you againſt the belief of it, ſince if it be, you muſt be driven to ſay that you comprehend the nature of God, which I hope you have too much religion as well as reaſon to affirm.

10. And indeed if we meet with ſo many inſuperable difficulties in the ſearch of nature, much more may we in the contemplation of its author, if the works of God do ſo puzzle and baffle our underſtandings, much more may they confeſs their deficiency when God himſelf is their ob-

ject, and if we are not able to explain creation, or give an account how the material world iſſued in time from the great Fountain of being, much leſs may we be ſuppoſed able to explain the eternal and ineffable generation of his divine and conſubſtantial word. But what then, ſhall we not believe it? Or rather ſhall we not ſay upon this occaſion, with the pious and ingenious Mr. Weſley *,

" Ineffable the way, for who
" Th' Almighty to perfection ever knew?
" But he himſelf has ſaid it, and it muſt be true."

Nay, to go lower yet, if there be ſo many things relating to extenſion, motion and figure (of all which we have clear ideas) which we cannot comprehend, and there reſult from them propoſitions which we know not what to make of, with how much greater reaſon may we expect to find what we cannot underſtand in the nature of an infinite Being, whereof we have no adequate idea. And indeed we meet with ſo many incomprehenſibles in the ſchool of nature, that one would think we ſhould be too much familiarized to them to think them ſtrange in that of religion, and God ſeems on purpoſe to exerciſe and diſcipline our underſtandings with what is above them in natural things, that ſo we might be the leſs ſurprized to find what paſſes our conception in his own infinite eſſence. Here then at leaſt you may confeſs your ignorance, and that without any reproach to your underſtandings, which were indeed intended for the contemplation, but not for the comprehenſion of an infinite object. You need not therefore here be backward to own, that you meet with what you cannot comprehend (it would indeed be a myſtery if you ſhould not) nor think it any diſgrace to have your eyes dazzled with that light at the inſupportable glory of which even the ſeraphim veil and cover theirs.

11. You may perceive by this that your denial of the doctrine of the Trinity, becauſe of the incomprehenſibility of it, proceeds upon no good conſequence; but you are alſo

* Life of Chriſt, p. 184.

further

further deſired to conſider the very bad one that it naturally leads to. You refuſe to receive this article, becauſe you cannot comprehend it; but beſides that your reaſon for this your refuſal is not good unleſs you could be ſuppoſed to comprehend every thing, even "the deep things of God." Pray conſider what the conſequence will be if you purſue your principle to the utmoſt, and conduct yourſelves entirely by its meaſures. Will it not inevitably lead you to the denial of all religion? This, perhaps, may ſtartle you, but think again. Will not this neceſſarily lead you to the denial of God, the foundation of all religion? For if you will not believe the trinal diſtinction of perſons in the divine eſſence, becauſe you cannot conceive how ſuch a thing can be, then may you not for the ſame reaſon refuſe as well to believe the divine eſſence itſelf, ſome of whoſe incommunicable attributes, ſuch as his ſelf-exiſtence, eternity, immenſity, &c. are as incomprehenſible as any thing in the notion of the Trinity can be. So that if you will but follow your meaſure from the denial of three, you may be quickly brought to deny even one. So directly does your principle of believing nothing but what you can comprehend lead to Atheiſm, and that with ſuch ſwift and wide ſtrides, that were it not for the aſſiſtance of the ſame expedient, your friends the Deiſts would be hardly able to follow you.

12. And now, Sirs, what do you think of your principle? Is it not a goodly one, and richly worth all the paſſion and zeal you have expreſſed for it? You know very well that M. Abbadie, in his excellent treatiſe of the divinity of Chriſt, has ſhewn you that upon one of your grounds (viz. the denial of that article) the Mahometan religion is preferable to the Chriſtian, and indeed that you are obliged by it to renounce Chriſtianity, and turn Mahometans. This truly was a home-thruſt. But yet you ſee the conſequence of your general principle reaches further, as leading you not only out of Chriſtianity, but out of all religion, whether natural or revealed, even beyond deiſm, even into atheiſm itſelf. If it does not actually lead you thither, the fault is

not

not in the principle, whoſe connexion with that conſequence is natural enough; but it is becauſe you are not ſo conſiſtent with yourſelves as to follow it. And indeed it is a great happineſs that you do not, (ſince if you were here better logicians, you would be worſe men) though it would be a much greater, if for the danger of being more conſiſtent with it, you would be perſuaded to lay it down.

13. And that you may be ſo, be pleaſed further to conſider, that though this principle of yours does not eventually carry you as far as Atheiſm, becauſe perhaps the horridneſs of the concluſion may be a counterweight againſt the force of the premiſes, (though you ſee it naturally tends that way) yet there is very great danger of its leading you effectually into Deiſm, that not being accounted now-a-days ſuch a very frightful thing. For as long as you hold, that what is above human reaſon is not to be believed, and upon that account reject the Chriſtian myſteries, becauſe they are above reaſon; you lie at the mercy of that argument that ſhall prove to you that theſe myſteries are indeed revealed, and that the genuine and natural ſenſe of the ſacred text declares for them. For if you once come to be convinced of that, you will then be obliged, in conſequence of your principle, to renounce that religion which reveals ſuch incredible things that is the Chriſtian, which will be a ſhrewd (indeed an invincible) temptation to you to throw up all revealed religion, and ſo to turn perfect Deiſts. And I pray God it may not have that effect upon you.

14. But as to the parting with Chriſtianity, that you will be further tempted to do upon another account. For when you have by your principle ſtript it, or I may ſay rather unbowelled it of its great and adorable myſteries, it will appear ſuch a poor, lank, ſlender thing to you, that you will hardly think it conſiderable enough to be revealed as a new and more perfect inſtitution by God, or to be received as ſuch by thinking and conſidering men. For what will ſuch find ſo conſiderable in Chriſtianity, (eſpecially as a new inſtitution) what ſo viſibly peculiar and aſſuredly diſtinguiſhing, what that may infallibly ſet it above an human inſtitution,

if

if it be once robbed of its myſteries? They may indeed think it a good plain piece of morals, and ſuch as exceeds any other of a known human compoſure, but how are they ſure but that the invention of man may be able to riſe ſo high, as to compoſe ſuch a ſyſtem as this, if you ſet aſide its myſteries? Which therefore I cannot but look upon of all the things that are intrinſic to it, (for I do not here conſider miracles) as the greateſt characters of its divinity. And ſome, perhaps, would be apt to think them ſuch as without which it would be hardly thought worthy of reception (eſpecially as a new inſtitution) even with the help of miracles, which men are always ready, and not without reaſon, to ſuſpect, when the matters for whoſe ſake they are wrought bear not ſufficient proportion to them. Which they would alſo perhaps be inclined to think to be the preſent caſe. For what (would they ſay) is there in the Chriſtian religion that deſerves ſo great ado, what that ſhould engage an omnipotent arm to introduce it into the world by ſuch mighty ſigns and wonders, if there be indeed nothing wonderful in it; that is, if you take away its myſteries. What cannot a good ſyſtem of morality (eſpecially if only a ſecond, and a little more correct edition of a former) be communicated to the world without alarming heaven and earth, and giving diſturbance to the courſe of nature? And if Chriſtianity be no more, what proportion (ſay they) will it bear to its miraculous introduction? And what will it be found to have ſo very conſiderable as either to deſerve or juſtify ſuch an apparatus? It muſt indeed be allowed by all to be a good wholeſome inſtitution for the direction of manners, but what is there ſo very great and admirable in it, what that either deſerves or anſwers to ſo many types, and figures, and prophetical predictions, what that ſo copiouſly ſets forth the manifold wiſdom of God, and the glory of his attributes, and the nothingneſs of the creature? And where are thoſe "deep things of God," that "eye hath not ſeen, nor ear "heard, nor have entered into the heart of man *," (a place which the Apoſtle applies out of the prophet Iſaiah to the

* 1 Cor. ii. 9, 10.

revela-

revelations of the Goſpel;) where, I ſay, are thoſe profound things which the ſpirit of God only that "ſearcheth all "things" could reveal, and which even now they are revealed, "the angels deſire to look into*." You will hardly find any thing of ſo raiſed a character in Chriſtianity, if you diveſt it of its myſteries, which therefore may juſtly be reckoned as the main pillars of it, without which it will have much ado to ſupport itſelf. So that in ſhort Chriſtianity not Myſterious, (how fond ſoever a certain author is of ſuch a religion) will make but a very little figure in proportion to its pomp and external ſplendor, and indeed will almoſt dwindle down into nothing.

15. It may indeed even without the myſteries make a ſhift to ſubſiſt as a mere ſyſtem of precepts, and rule of life, though even thus conſidered it will be greatly impaired, and ſuffer much diſadvantage (as wanting thoſe convincing demonſtrations of God's hatred of ſin, and of his love towards mankind, and withal thoſe endearing and perſuaſive arguments for their returns of love, gratitude, and obedience towards him, which can only be derived from the redemption of the world by the death and ſatisfaction of its divine undertaker) but as a covenant of grace eſtabliſhed betwixt God and his offending and eſtranged creature it cannot poſſibly ſtand, but muſt fall to the ground. So that though the moral or legal part (as I may call it) of Chriſtianity may at a hard rate continue after the downfall of its myſteries, yet its federal part, and all that is properly Goſpel in it, muſt needs be involved in the ruin, and fall with them, that being all built upon the ſatisfaction of Chriſt, as that again upon his divinity, which is therefore the very foundation of the Chriſtian religion, as M. Abbadie has by variety of demonſtration proved it to be. If then you would have that divine inſtitution ſtand, and if you would ſtand faſt in it, (both which I am willing to ſuppoſe) have a care how you remove its myſteries, conſidering how fundamental they are to the building, and how great a ſhare of its ſacred weight reſts upon them. But endeavour rather to remove your own

* 1 Pet. i. 12.

preju-

prejudices, to mortify your underſtandings, to ſtudy humility, and to reſtrain the too free ſallies of your too curious and over-venturous reaſon, by ſtill and ſilent reflections upon God's infinite greatneſs, and your own almoſt as great infirmities, by which one thought well purſued, you will (by the grace of God) come to a better underſtanding of yourſelves than to reject any of his plain revelations merely becauſe you cannot conceive them, and ſo leaving light and viſion to the other life, will be content with other good Chriſtians, humbly to believe and adore in this.

16. Gentlemen, I beſeech you ſeriouſly to conſider what with Chriſtian charity and all due civil reſpect I have here laid before you; and if upon conſideration of it you find any weight in it, to let it have its full force and effect upon you. Which if you do, I hope it may ſerve, by the bleſſing of God, (to whom for that end I humbly devote this labour) to convince you, or at leaſt to put you upon ſuch better conſiderations of your own as may. For I pretend not here to have ſaid all, but to have left many things to the enlargement and improvement of your own meditation, conſidering the impropriety of doing otherwiſe to perſons of your parts and learning, which I pray God to ſanctify and increaſe to you. Whereby you may perceive that I am not againſt your making uſe of your reaſon. No; I would only have you reaſon rightly, and that you may do ſo, would have you by all human methods to improve and cultivate your reaſon as much as you can, being well perſuaded that as a half-view of things makes men opiniative, diſputatious, and dogmatical, ſo a clear and thorough light makes them humble, and diſtruſtful of themſelves; and that the more cultivated and improved any man's natural reaſon is, the eaſier it will be for him to captivate it to the obedience of faith.

POST-

POSTSCRIPT.

SINCE the committing of theſe papers to the preſs, I have had the pleaſure to peruſe Mr. Whiſton's New Theory of the Earth, for which extraordinary and truly great performance I return him all due thanks, and am very glad to ſee ſo great a maſter of reaſon and philoſophy expreſs ſo awful and reverential a regard to religion in general, and in particular to the ſacred myſteries of it, againſt which both human reaſon and natural philoſophy have been of late ſo abuſively and profanely employed. How far this ingenious and learned author makes good his great undertaking, or whether this or the former theoriſt be moſt likely to be in the right, I ſhall not take upon me to examine: I only make this obſervation from both their wonderful attempts, that whether they are in the right or no, as to their reſpective accounts of things, yet they have at leaſt gone ſo far, and offered ſo fairly towards a true explanation of them, as to convince any competent and indifferent reader that the Moſaic records concerning the greater phenomena of creation and providence, are not really of ſo deſperate a nature as they were once preſumed to be, but are in themſelves capable of, and may perhaps in time actually have (if they have not already) a true natural ſolution. As for inſtance, a univerſal flood without a miracle, or that the world ſhould be wholly drowned in a natural way, or according to the laws of motion already ſettled, and by a train of cauſes already laid in nature, has been hitherto thought an incomprehenſible, and accordingly an impoſſible thing. But now if theſe two mighty geniuſes who have undertaken to give a natural account of this ſtupendous revolution, have neither of them pitched upon the very preciſe way and manner whereby it was brought to paſs, yet I think it cannot be denied but that they have ſaid enough between them to convince

vince that the thing was naturally poſſible, and that a true natural account may be given of it, though they ſhould be ſuppoſed not to have hit directly upon that which is ſo. That is, I mean, they have repreſented it at leaſt as a conceivable thing, whether they themſelves have had the good fortune to conceive of it exactly as it was or no. Upon which it is very natural, and no leſs pertinent to the concern in hand to make this further reflection, that we ſhould not be over haſty to pronounce any thing (even of a phyſical, much leſs of a religious nature,) to be impoſſible, only becauſe it appears to us to be incomprehenſible. For beſides that the incomprehenſibility of a thing is (as this whole diſcourſe ſhews) no certain argument of its impoſſibility, and that what appears incomprehenſible to *our* underſtandings may at the ſame time be well comprehended by thoſe of angels, not to ſay of wiſer men, perhaps that which appears to us at preſent to be above all comprehenſion, may in proceſs of time, and upon further reflection and experience ſo brighten and clear up to our minds, as to be comprehended, or at leaſt to be thought of a comprehenſible and poſſible nature even by our more improved ſelves. For the incomprehenſibility of a thing as ſuch being no abſolute affection or intrinſic denomination of the thing itſelf from its own nature, but only ſuch as affects it from without and in relation to the preſent capacity of our underſtandings, there needs no alteration in the nature of the thing to make that comprehenſible which was before incomprehenſible, a change in our underſtandings is ſufficient, upon whoſe greater improvement alone an incomprehenſible may become a comprehenſible object. So that beſides the nullity of the conſequence from the incomprehenſibility of a thing to its impoſſibility, even the principle itſelf from which that conſequence is pretended to be drawn may be removed, by the preſent comprehenſion of what paſſed before with us for an incomprehenſible propoſition. Upon both which conſiderations we are admoniſhed to be very cautious how we conclude any thing in nature, much more in Scripture, to be impoſſible, becauſe to us incomprehenſible. And it is the

very uſe Mr. Whiſton himſelf makes of the latter of them in the concluſion of his excellent work, from which I think it worth while to tranſcribe a paſſage both for the advantage of the preſent argument, and the greater conviction of the reader, to whom, as well as to myſelf, it muſt be no little ſatisfaction to ſee the ſentiments of ſo great an author concur with mine.

"The meaſure of our preſent knowledge *," ſays he, "ought not to be eſteemed the κριτήριον, or teſt of truth, (the very propoſition almoſt in terms of my fourth chapter) or to be oppoſed to the accounts received from profane antiquity, much leſs to the inſpired writings. For notwithſtanding that ſeveral particulars relating to the eldeſt condition of the world and its great cataſtrophes, examined and compared with ſo much philoſophy as was till lately known, were plainly unaccountable, and, naturally ſpeaking, impoſſible; yet we ſee now nature is more fully, more certainly, and more ſubſtantially underſtood, that the ſame things approve themſelves to be plain, eaſy, and rational. It is therefore folly in the higheſt degree to reject the truth or divine authority of the holy Scriptures, becauſe we cannot give our minds particular ſatisfaction as to the manner, nay, or even poſſibility of ſome things therein aſſerted. Since we have ſeen ſo many of thoſe things which ſeemed the moſt incredible in the whole Bible, and gave the greateſt ſcruple and ſcandal to philoſophic minds, ſo fully and particularly atteſted, and next to demonſtrated from certain principles of aſtronomy and natural knowledge, it is but reaſonable to expect in due time a like ſolution of the other difficulties. It is but juſt ſure to depend upon the veracity of thoſe holy writers in other aſſertions, whoſe fidelity is ſo entirely eſtabliſhed in theſe hitherto equally unaccountable ones. The obvious, plain, or literal ſenſe of the ſacred Scriptures ought not without great reaſon to be eluded, or laid aſide: ſeveral of thoſe very places which ſeemed very much to require the ſame hitherto, appearing now to the minuteſt circumſtances true and rational, according to the

* Page 379.

ſtricteſt

ſtricteſt and moſt literal interpretation of them. We may be under an obligation to believe ſuch things on the authority of the holy Scriptures as are properly myſteries; that is, though not really contradictory, yet plainly unaccountable to our (preſent degree of) knowledge and reaſon. Thus the ſacred hiſtories of the original conſtitution, and great cataſtrophes of the world, have been in the paſt ages the objects of the faith of Jews and Chriſtians, though the divine Providence had not afforded ſo much light as that they could otherwiſe ſatisfy themſelves in the credibility of them, till the new improvements in philoſophy. And this is but juſt and reaſonable: for ſure the ignorance or incapacity of the creature does by no means afford ſufficient ground for incredulity, or juſtify men in their rejecting divine revelation, and impeaching the veracity or providence of the creator." With which weighty, and to the preſent purpoſe very pertinent words of this worthy author I ſeal up my own, and leave them both to the conſideration of the reader.

A

PRESERVATIVE

AGAINST THE

PUBLICATIONS

DISPERSED BY

MODERN SOCINIANS:

IN WHICH

THE IMPIETY AND ABSURDITY OF THEIR PRINCIPLES ARE CLEARLY SHEWN.

ADDRESSED

BY A COUNTRY CLERGYMAN

TO

HIS PARISHIONERS.

A PRESERVATIVE AGAINST SOCINIANISM.

MY DEAR BRETHREN,

YOU live in an age, and in a country, in which many think they have a right to do, and ſay, what they pleaſe. Thus far, indeed, we are ſtill under the protection of the law, that one man cannot ſhoot another through the head, without being hanged for it; unleſs he does it upon a principle of honour. But he may aſperſe characters, accuſe the innocent, put darkneſs for light, and light for darkneſs, blaſpheme God, diſhonour the king, and expoſe the nakedneſs of his country, without being called to any account. He may erect a literary ſtar-chamber, wherein all works, in defence of true religion, and the polity of the church of England, are miſrepreſented, and mangled, without juſtice or mercy, for five-and-thirty years together; their ears cropped, their noſes ſlit, and thus diſfigured they are turned out into the ſtreets, to be ſcorned by the public; who are hence to collect, that our faith is defenceleſs, and our writers ridiculous.

Before the flood of Noah, the earth was filled with violence, God was deſpiſed, all goodneſs was trampled under

ſoot, and men were too far gone to take any warning. The Goſpel tells us it ſhall be ſo again: and all good people, who are not impoſed upon by empty ſounds, can plainly ſee that licentiouſneſs, ſo loudly glorified under the name of liberty in theſe latter days, will be the grand inſtrument in bringing the new world up to that degree of corruption, which deſtroyed the old.

That the influence of Chriſtianity, which is now ſo much decayed, may be leſs and leſs every day, books and pamphlets are induſtriouſly handed about, among the common people, to turn away their hearts from Chriſtian truth to the fables of infidelity. I do not mean that theſe publications abound with oaths, curſes, and obſcenity; (though the preſs is daily delivered of them alſo) but that they give God the lie in all the doctrines, by which our holy religion is diſtinguiſhed; and if they ſhould be attended to, and received, muſt provoke him to tranſplant the Chriſtian faith to ſome other quarter of the earth, which has not ſo much neglected his goodneſs.

Some may promiſe themſelves, that when this ſhall happen, a ſtate of perfect freedom will take place; but, let them know, that how freely ſoever men may offend againſt one another, God is not to be intimidated by the claims of licentiouſneſs. The God of Chriſtians is, and will be, the ruler of the world, whether libertines conſent to his dominion or not: and they may aſſure themſelves, that the departure of the Chriſtian religion will be no peaceable event. When the Founder of our faith expired, the heavens were darkened, the earth ſhook, and the minds of men were troubled, and confounded. When God departed from the Jewiſh nation, diſcord, peſtilence, and famine, all the horrors of war, and all the miſeries of ſedition and ſlavery ſucceeded. The deſtruction of the world by the flood, the burning of Sodom, the captivity of Jeruſalem, and other like viſitations, are to be underſtood as ſo many warnings of that fate, which all apoſtates will meet with in another world, and as examples of what will moſt probably befall them in this world.

My

My brethren, I am one of thoſe who, with God's help, would willingly make a ſtand againſt that torrent of hereſy, and impiety, which threatens to break in upon us: but there is no chance of doing this, to any purpoſe, unleſs we can remove one fatal maſtake, which moſt ignorant people now labour under, and of which the enemies of our faith never fail to take advantage. The miſtake is this; that Chriſtians may reckon themſelves ſecure of the favour of God, if they are not guilty of cheating, whoring, drinking, robbing, and murdering. This is the error of the ignorant: and the artful flatter them in it; telling them, that if they do but lead what they call good lives, articles of faith are but matters of opinion, and therefore they need not be nice about their creed. To make this plauſible notion the more agreeable, one of our moſt elegant writers, who was a better poet than a divine, has put it into rhyme:

" For modes of faith let ſenſeleſs zealots fight,
" His can't be wrong, whoſe life is in the right."

But a right life can no more grow upon a wrong faith, than grapes can grow upon thiſtles. This is true, for more reaſons than one; but chiefly, becauſe the worſt ſort of wickedneſs is the wickedneſs of the mind againſt God; upon which, I ſhall beg leave to offer you ſome conſiderations, in the following chapter.

CHAP. I.

OF SPIRITUAL WICKEDNESS.

THE Chriſtian life comprehends two great branches of duty: the firſt towards God, the ſecond towards our neighbour. God has an undoubted claim to the firſt place; our neighbour has the next; and we are to love him, and help him, from a ſenſe of our duty to God, who hath commanded us ſo to do. But if I ſtumble in the beginning of my duty, and offend againſt God himſelf, what reaſon have I to expect his favour for what I do to any body? Will

acts of kindneſs towards a fellow ſubject excuſe me for an act of rebellion againſt my prince, or ſtop the execution of a ſtatute againſt treaſon? What was the offence which brought death into the world? Not an offence againſt ſociety, for there was none; but only againſt a poſitive command of God. It was revealed, that to eat the fruit of the forbidden tree, would be attended with a deadly effect.—This revelation was diſputed; the truth of God was called in queſtion; the luſt of pride prevailed, and the ſentence of death followed. Therefore if Adam deſtroyed the whole world by ſinning againſt the truth of God, certainly any ſingle man may deſtroy himſelf by the ſame means; though he ſhould give all his goods to feed the poor, and his body to be burned for the good of ſociety.

There is another ſhort way of expoſing the ſame miſtake. Conſider the character of the devil. He is no member of ſociety; and, being a ſpirit, cannot commit the ſins of the body. He is no glutton, no drunkard, no miſer, no adulterer; his wickedneſs is all of a ſpiritual kind; or, in other words, it is the wickedneſs not of the body, but of the ſpirit. It conſiſts in oppoſing the wiſdom of God, perverting his word, miſrepreſenting his juſtice, deſpiſing his incarnation, ſuggeſting evil thoughts to men, promoting hereſies, and dividing the church of Chriſt: in a word, it is the buſineſs of the apoſtate ſpirit to counter-work the ways of the Divine Spirit by all the efforts of ſubtilty, falſehood, pride, malice, and contradiction. Therefore, he who oppoſes God, as the devil doth, muſt be the diſciple and miniſter of the devil; and if he do the ſame work, what can be expected but that he will receive the ſame wages? The character moſt acceptable to the devil, becauſe the fitteſt for his purpoſes, is that which moſt nearly reſembles his own: and, for the forming of ſuch a character, he employs the moſt refined of all his temptations. The ſtupid ſot, the profane ſwearer, and the rotten debauchee, are low-lived examples of vice; the meaneſt of the devil's ſcholars. Beſides, theſe are ſometimes known to be weary of their vices, and to forſake his party. But the ſpeculative and philoſophical

philoſophical ſinner, is a man of figure, whoſe pride will never admit of his reformation. The Scribes and Phariſees, men conceited of their learning, found ways of eluding the divine law: they therefore adhered to the intereſts of Satan, and were immoveable in their errors; while the publican was wrought upon to renounce his extortion, and the harlot waſhed away her ſtains, with the tears of repentance. The extortioner is drawn away by the love of money, which "anſwereth all things;" Eccleſ. x. 19; and the harlot is frequently the victim of treachery, poverty, and a bad education: but the ſinner, who errs upon principle, hath ſet himſelf in oppoſition to the will of God. Meaner ſinners tranſgreſs the law, but he judges it: and where pride is entwined with error, a man ſinks with a weight at his heels, which will never let him riſe any more.

What are we then to think, but that he who is moſt like the devil, in his wickedneſs, is moſt hateful to God? And this is the caſe with the ſpiritual ſeducer. Hence, the Goſpel gives us warning, that the "wiſdom of this world "is fooliſhneſs with God;" that every thought is to be "brought into captivity;" that "imaginations" are to be "caſt down;" that Satan hath his "depths," his "myſteries "of iniquity," as well as his more groſs and ſhallow deceits; that he has agents to recommend his principles, "falſe "apoſtles, deceitful workers, transforming themſelves into "the apoſtles of Chriſt," and ſolemnly preaching down the Goſpel, under the outward profeſſion of preaching it up in a purer manner.

Theſe, my brethren, are dangers, of which few Chriſtians are now aware; and therefore the work of every deceiver, who underſtands his trade, is more eaſy and more ſucceſsful than it uſed to be. The cant of liberty of conſcience, and the authority of private judgment, (both of which are extended to an unlimited freedom of diſputing the whole revelation of God to man) have been repeated in people's ears till they are intoxicated with the ſounds, and can ſee no criminals left in the nation, but ſuch as are condemned at the Old Bailey.—When a felon is convicted, and ſentence

is

is paſſed upon him, nobody arraigns the law of cruelty, the judges of partiality, or the jury of perſecution. But when the blaſpheming Socinian goes about to raiſe diviſions in the church, and to rob Chriſtians of their faith, the moſt valuable property they have upon earth, an outcry is raiſed if you offer to interrupt him. Popery perſecutes the truth: therefore Proteſtant blaſphemy muſt eſcape without cenſure; than which, there can be no greater ſcandal to the Proteſtant profeſſion, nor greater matter of triumph to the Papiſts, who wiſh to ſee all Proteſtants go a round-about way, through Socinianiſm, into Popery.

Upon the Chriſtian plan then, however bad carnal wickedneſs may be, ſpiritual wickedneſs is worſe: for the mind is better than the body in itſelf, and conſequently, according to an eſtabliſhed proverb, worſe in its corruption. Therefore no obedience can be acceptable to God, without that which is the beſt of all, the obedience of the underſtanding; no courage is comparable to that which contends earneſtly for "the faith delivered to the ſaints;" no temperance is like that which refrains from high thoughts, and preſumptuous imaginations. Let us then be no longer ſtunned with the affected good lives of ſuch as fail in this ſort of obedience, whoſe minds are at variance with the revealed wiſdom of God: for there is wickedneſs blacker than that of common immorality: and moral virtues are ſomething, or nothing, or worſe than nothing, according to the principles from which they proceed. If a man, who has made a practice of being drunk every day of his life, ſhould keep himſelf ſober for one day, only that he may have an opportunity of picking his neighbour's pocket, or over-reaching him in a bargain; of what value is ſuch ſobriety? Is it not worſe than drunkenneſs? for his drunkenneſs is beaſtly, and that is the worſt you can ſay of it; but his ſobriety is diabolical. You may apply this to other caſes: and, let me tell you, that if ſpiritual wickedneſs were but rightly underſtood, as it ſubſiſts in the devil, the original of it all, men could never be cheated, as they now are, with the plauſible ſpeeches of thoſe, who lie in wait to deceive them: and, I verily believe, one

good diſcourſe upon the character of Satan, ſtripping that wolf of his philoſopher's coat, and his ſheep's cloathing, would have more effect toward keeping many people ſteady to the truth, than an hundred treatiſes upon particular points of doctrine.—And this leads me naturally to ſhew what arts are practiſed, to propagate hereſy and infidelity.

CHAP. II.

OF THE METHOD OF THOSE WHO SPREAD FALSE DOCTRINE.

AS there were falſe prophets againſt the Law of Moſes, ſo we are told there ſhall be falſe prophets againſt the Goſpel; and as the dignity and value of our law is above that of the Jews, we are bound to look more ſharply after thoſe who would corrupt it. The church never was, nor ever will be, without them; and the Apoſtle informs us, that as the church grows older, they ſhall "wax worſe and "worſe." Our bleſſed Maſter has given us one rule for detecting them, which will ſeldom fail us: "Beware (ſays "he) of falſe prophets, which ſhall come to you in ſheep's "clothing." Here their outward appearance is deſcribed; they make their approach to you, not as wolves, but as ſheep; not as infidels, but as Chriſtians; not as falſe prophets, but as the only true prophets you ever met with. Indeed, my brethren, it is very weak and childiſh to imagine that nothing is ſin but that which calls itſelf ſo. Does not every bad thing give itſelf a good name? Therefore when a ſeducer makes an attempt upon your faith, you muſt not expect that he will give you notice of his intention at the market-croſs, like a common cryer, and ſay, "Now, good people, look to yourſelves, for I am about to deny all the doctrines of the Goſpel, and am perſuaded I can make a better religion than that of the Bible." If he ſhould make ſuch a groſs miſtake as this, his maſter would either diſcard him

him as a traitor, or give him up as an inſtrument unfit for all the purpoſes of ſeduction. Satan himſelf, when engaged in the ſublimeſt of his undertakings, never works in the odious character of an enemy to God and man; but begins with "transforming himſelf into an angel of light:" and his aſſiſtants, inſtead of avowing their wickedneſs, are generally more pompous and plauſible in their profeſſions than other men.—Conſcience, reaſon, charity, piety, purity, and a love of truth, are all their own, and others are no better than counterfeits. Therefore when a falſe teacher makes an attempt upon your faith, you may expect him to accoſt you in words to this effect.—"My Chriſtian brethren, I am a ſincere lover of the Goſpel, and having the deepeſt concern for its honour, I would guard you againſt thoſe who decry human reaſon, and forbid you to make uſe of it, that they may obtrude ſuch doctrines as are agreeable neither to reaſon nor the word of God. Religion is the moſt valuable inheritance of the human race; and if, by God's bleſſing, I can bring you to entertain the ſame views of it with myſelf, we ſhall rejoice together. Though Popery is reformed, yet many errors ſtill remain, which, by the uſe of reaſon, may be driven out. Reaſon is the gift of God, and ſo is the Scripture, and they cannot be contrary to one another. There is a ſpirit of cenſoriouſneſs, which many profeſſing Chriſtians indulge with too little reſtraint; but the true Chriſtian beareth all things. My brethren, be not moved with the raſh cenſures and reproaches of men: if you will live godly in Chriſt Jeſus, you muſt ſuffer perſecution." Theſe expreſſions are taken from a ſmall canting Socinian tract, ſold for ONE PENNY, and diſperſed in great numbers, to poiſon the minds of the common people. You would take the author for a ſincere believer of the holy Scripture, perfect in his charity, and fortified with the ſpirit of a martyr. But be not deceived: all is not gold that glitters. Let me, therefore, beg your attention, while I make ſome remarks on theſe extracts, to ſhew you that his attempts are quite contrary to his declarations, and his doctrines ſubverſive of the whole plan of Chriſtianity; and then you will

ſee

ſee what a vaſt difference there is between the ſound of words and the ſenſe of them.

In the firſt place then, all ſenſible people reckon it a very ſuſpicious circumſtance, when a man opens a cauſe with a panegyric upon himſelf. If a ſtranger, when you enter his ſhop, were to ſalute you with the praiſes of his own honeſty, his ſtrict regard to the honour of trade, and his love to all his cuſtomers, paſt, preſent, and to come, you would look upon all this as a bait, and be certain he intended to cheat you. So our Socinian pamphleteer, in his title, calls himſelf a "Lover of the Goſpel:" he dare not leave you to find this out by his book; but hopes you will be blinded towards the miſchief of it, by a good opinion of his character, before you enter upon it. He profeſſes the deepeſt concern for the honour of the Goſpel; but, as he denies all its ſaving doctrines, who can take his word, even though he ſhould confirm it with an hundred oaths?

Then he exhorts you to make uſe of your own reaſon, that is, to ſee things with your own eyes, and not be impoſed upon by what you are taught; which is very excellent advice; but he has not followed it himſelf, neither does he intend that you ſhall follow it. His notions are borrowed from Socinus, and his Deiſtical followers, particularly from Chubb, whoſe writings contain all the ſecrets of the preſent reforming divinity. So that he cannot juſtly pretend to the merit of having uſed his own reaſon. And as to you, he writes his pamphlet with the hopes of bringing you to entertain the ſame views of Chriſtianity with himſelf: therefore his compliments to your reaſon are nothing but the flattery of one, who is all the while ſupplanting your reaſon, that he may draw you away into his own point of view: in which you will ſee no more of Chriſtianity than he does: and this he tells you will be a great bleſſing. For this he helps you to ſome interpretations of texts of Scripture, ſo very much out of the way, that your own reaſon would never have hit upon them: neither would his, if he had not been told of them.

The

The imperfection of the reformation is a topic much declaimed upon of late years; and this author is of opinion, that though popery is gone, many errors are ſtill remaining. In anſwer to which, we have this to ſay for our divines at the reformation, that we are ſure they believed the Scripture; and their writings ſhew that they underſtood it: but as to the Reformers of this preſent time, we are not ſure they do either the one, or the other. The lovers of the Goſpel, in Luther's days, took off the ſuperſtitious dreſs of Chriſtianity, but left the body of it ſecure. If we go to work now, we muſt reform it to the bone; and even then ſome nice judges may be offended with the ſkeleton, and never reſt, till they have ſet up the idol of heatheniſm, as ſome attempted to do about fifty years ago; and their officiating miniſter was Mr. John Toland, who compoſed a form of divine ſervice to the infinite and eternal univerſe; the το παν; from the worſhip of which they have called themſelves Pantheiſts.

The author proceeds to aſſure us, that as reaſon and the Scripture are each of them "the gift of God, they cannot be contrary to one another." Right reaſon (when we have found out what that is) cannot poſſibly be contrary to the Scripture, becauſe the Scripture contains the reaſon of God: but the reaſon of any particular man may be very contrary to it. Dean Swift obſerved, very juſtly, that "reaſon in itſelf is a very different thing from reaſon in particular men." So that we want a diſtinction here; for when we ſpeak of reaſon in itſelf, every man makes himſelf the compliment to think that his reaſon is the thing intended. But it is one thing to have the gift of reaſon, as a human creature, and another thing to have the right uſe of it. The firſt we have by nature; the ſecond is the work of grace: and if a writer put one of theſe for the other, or imagine them to be the ſame thing, he will ſoon talk very abſurdly. Voltaire had the gift of reaſon, but he had not the gift of uſing it; for on every ſubject that relates to Chriſtianity, he reaſoned like an ideot: yet with a miſchievous vein of wit, which eaſily catches people of corrupt minds. The philoſophiſing Greeks,

to

to whom "Chriſt crucified" was "fooliſhneſs," had their reaſon like other men; but education had perverted it, and rendered it contradictory to the reaſon of God; ſo that it was of no uſe to them in divine ſubjects, but rather an hindrance. A ſimilar train of education will have juſt the ſame effect now: and you muſt not expect that any perſon, who abuſes his reaſon, will confeſs that he does ſo. He will go on to boaſt of reaſon in general, and make no exceptions to the diſadvantage of his own reaſon in particular. When human reaſon ſees things as the wiſdom of God ſees them, then it performs its proper office; but when it ſees them otherwiſe, then it takes the name of philoſophy, and becomes fooliſhneſs, like the boaſted reaſon of the Greeks, who, "profeſſing themſelves to be wiſe, became fools." The world has always been full enough of this ſort of reaſon. How common is it for people to talk about conſcience; and yet how few are they who conſider what it is!——For conſcience is an agreement or coincidence of the judgment of man with the judgment of God.—When conſcience condemns what God approves, or approves what God condemns, it is no longer conſcience, but conceit and deluſion. The conſcience of the Socinian ſcruples the worſhip of the church of England as idolatry; but there is no more reaſon in it, than in that conſcience of the Muſſelmen, which ſends them two thouſand miles on a pilgrimage to the tomb of their falſe prophet. Our author has been very free in delivering his opinion about reaſon; but what reaſon is, and what is the proper uſe of it; how it may be improved and ſtrengthened, and how it may be ſo weakened as to judge falſely of every thing, like the jaundiced eye, are queſtions for which he ſeems very much unprepared. The mind undoubtedly hath its diſtempers, like the body. The pride of philoſophy was the diſtemper of the Greeks; the love of this world was the diſtemper of the Jews; and neither of theſe could make ſenſe of the Goſpel of Jeſus Chriſt.

It will be worth our while to enquire, why he guards his readers ſo particularly againſt cenſorioufneſs. He finds, by experience, that his own doctrines and writings are odious

to

to all ſincere believers, whether Churchmen or Diſſenters; and therefore wiſhes, as any other perſon would in his circumſtances, to eſcape untouched, becauſe his principles of religion are too unſound to bear any ſevere examination. But he who has uſed the word of God ſo freely, and has not ſcrupled to accuſe the church of error, abſurdity, and the utmoſt impiety, becauſe it does not agree with his fancy, muſt not expect to be commended, till we have renounced our faith, or loſt our underſtanding. I grant we ought to be charitable and merciful to thoſe who offend, either through ignorance, or infirmity; but neither of theſe will be pleaded by one, who tells us he is guided by reaſon, in every ſtep he has taken.

Every Chriſtian, who has not been impoſed upon by ſelf-intereſted counſellors, muſt know that zeal towards God is a duty as neceſſary and laudable as charity towards men. The church of Epheſus is praiſed in the Scripture, for "not "bearing them that are evil, and for trying them which "ſay they are Apoſtles, and are not, and" finding them "liars." Rev. ii. 2. Without doubt theſe lying Apoſtles, in the church of Epheſus, whoſe cauſe would not endure the probe, had many things to ſay againſt the cenſoriouſneſs of thoſe who detected them. But we are taught by this, and many other examples, that the cenſoriouſneſs of faith is more acceptable to God, than the affected moderation of infidelity: and therefore every good man will wiſh to be called cenſorious by thoſe, whom it is the duty of every true Chriſtian to cenſure.

The author, however, has fortified himſelf, and endeavours to fortify his readers, againſt every thing that may happen in this way. "Be not moved," ſays he, "with "the raſh cenſures of men:" that is, go on boldly in your errors, contradicting the Goſpel with an apoſtolical freedom of ſpeech; and, if you are confronted with the Scriptures, and convicted of blaſphemy, perſevere unto the end. Such is the advice which Pride (the moſt miſchievous of all counſellors) whiſpers into the ear: "If thou haſt erred, perſiſt, and juſtify it; for it is poſſible thou mayeſt get the victory by

by this means; and victory is oftentimes of more moment than truth. Perhaps thou art a leading man, and the eſteem of thy wiſdom will influence the conduct of others; and if ſo, one baſe retraction may pull down all thou haſt built. Be ſure, then, that it is honourable, it is ediſying, it is for the glory of God, that thou ſhouldeſt be obſtinate." Pride communicates this advice in a whiſper, but the author ſpeaks it out; and, what is very wonderful, it ſeems never once to have entered into his head that he may be miſtaken. If any man ſhould be enticed to follow him, he, too, is thenceforward to commence infallible; never to be turned, never to be moved, never to hear any thing that is advanced in oppoſition to his impiety.—How great and noble would this conſtancy be in a better cauſe! But here it is lamentable to ſee the deluſion to which the human heart is expoſed. Conceit, obſtinacy, and contradiction, when ſitting in judgment upon themſelves, claim all the honours due to perſecuted truth, candour, and wiſdom.

CHAP. III.

A BRIEF ACCOUNT OF THE SOCINIAN ERRORS.

NOW we have conſidered the nature of ſpiritual wickedneſs, and the diſguiſes under which falſe teachers recommend themſelves, we are prepared to take a view of the doctrines they are labouring to introduce. Theſe are to be found in a ſmall publication above-mentioned, which calls itſelf "An Appeal to the ſerious and candid Profeſſors of Chriſtianity." I call them *doctrines*, for want of a better word; but they are in reality nothing more than ſo many negatives put upon the doctrines of the Goſpel.

You will not ſo readily underſtand what it is to deny the Chriſtian faith, till you have recollected, in the firſt place, what the Chriſtian faith is: you will therefore give me leave to remind you of it in as few words as poſſible.

The Chriſtian is one who lives by faith. He knows that of himſelf he has no ability to do the will of God, and therefore applies for the aſſiſtance of that bleſſed Spirit who is called the comforter, and, according to Chriſt's promiſe, is to be in us, and abide with us for ever. He knows that man is fallen into ſin, and death, which are the works of the devil; and that Chriſt came into the world for no other purpoſe but to deſtroy them: to purge away ſin, and to prevail over death.—That as we are in a forfeited ſtate, our redemption is the work of God's free grace, to which we have no claim, by nature. That he who effected this redemption, was the divine Perſon to whom the prophet Iſaiah ſpake, ſaying, "Behold, your God will come, and "ſave you." That he fulfilled all the ſacrifices of the law, by the offering of himſelf once for all, and taſting of death for every man: ſo that in him we have now received that atonement which the law deſcribed, but could not accompliſh.

You have here a ſhort draught of the Chriſtian religion, with its principal, or leading doctrines. The rainbow, when its colours are moſt ſplendid, is not more viſible in the ſky, than theſe doctrines are in the Bible: and therefore good and wiſe men have preached, and written, and pleaded for them, and ſuffered for them, even unto death, in almoſt every age, and every kingdom of the world; and we ſhall at laſt ſee them crowned, in heaven, for a faithful adherence to them. What think you then of an author, who, being wiſer than his neighbours, offers himſelf to you as a "lover of the Goſpel, deeply concerned for its honour," and denies them every one; who inſtructs us, in other words, that human reaſon is to furniſh a man with all his religious notions, and that the Scripture is to give them countenance; that man has power enough of himſelf to do the will of God; that he is not born in ſin, nor elected by the divine grace; that our Redeemer is no Redeemer, but a good moral example; that he is not God, and that he hath made no atonement for our ſins?

I deſire

I deſire to know how the wit of man, when it has got this new religion, can put it into a creed? You cannot begin in the common form, "I believe, &c." you muſt ſay, "I do *not* believe—that any thing more than the religion of human reaſon is neceſſary to profeſſors of Chriſtianity; I have no need of faith; I want not the grace of God; I need not be called, nor elected, by the divine favour; I do not own Jeſus Chriſt for my God; neither do I deſire him to pay any price for my redemption." This negative confeſſion, fitter ſurely for a necromancer than a profeſſor of Chriſtianity, is the favourite object, for the intereſts of which a clamorous party aſſembled, contributed, petitioned, and blotted tons of paper. For this, an unhappy gentleman left his miniſtry in the church of England, to preach up the God of Mahometans, in a chamber; and calls this "confeſſing Chriſt before men!" For this, their pamphlets are diſperſed by thouſands, to turn the affections of the ignorant from the ineſtimable truths of the Goſpel, and inflame their fancies with a ſet of opinions, which can only lead them to perdition. To draw men from the light of the Goſpel, into Socinian darkneſs, is like the traffic of thoſe who go about and deceive the minds of the Britiſh poor with lying repreſentations, to draw them from their native land to ſome barren colony, where they find nothing but diſappointments, hard labour, poverty, and putrid diſtempers. The change from Chriſtianity to Socinianiſm is as little to be envied, as the tranſmigration of thoſe who ſhould leave the ſcenery of paradiſe, and the plenty of Canaan, to aſſociate with the ſavages of the South, on a weather-beaten rock in the Magellanic ocean, where enjoyment could be nothing but infatuation, and a true ſenſe of their condition, whenever they ſhould return to it, could end in nothing but horror and deſpair.

I ſhall now beg your attention, while I ſhew you, more particularly, the falſe opinions of our Socinian author, together with the dangerous advice he gives you concerning the chief doctrines of Chriſtianity:—and I perſuade myſelf

you will immediately know how to judge of theſe things, when they are ſtripped of his plauſible recommendations.

CHAP. IV.

OF THE USE OF REASON IN MATTERS OF RELIGION.

HE bids you "diſtruſt all thoſe who decry human reaſon." But, if you take his advice, you muſt diſtruſt the Bible; which informs us, in the beginning of Geneſis, that "every "imagination of the thoughts of man's heart is only evil "continually:" and ſuch is the doctrine of St. Paul, who has taught us, that "the natural man receiveth not the "things of the Spirit of God, neither can he know them, "becauſe they are ſpiritually diſcerned." So that he who uſes only his natural reaſon, without ſome higher principle of diſcernment, which is the gift of God, cannot underſtand the matters of the Chriſtian religion. This poor man forgets that Adam and all his poſterity are fallen into ſin and infirmity, and hopes you will diſtruſt thoſe whoſe duty it is to put you in mind of it: as indeed the Bible itſelf does, from one end of it to the other. We read in the laſt chapter of the Revelation, that whoſoever "loveth and maketh a "lie," will be excluded from the kingdom of heaven. What? Is it poſſible to love a lie? And are not the affections miſerably depraved, which are capable of ſuch a love; eſpecially, if that lie is pointed againſt the veracity of God, and the truth of his religion; which is the ſort of lie here intended? And what faculty is it that makes ſuch a lie? Is it not human reaſon? No, ſays the Socinian; it is the abuſe of reaſon. True; and this is the very thing he has forgotten; for man fell from reaſon into the abuſe of reaſon. Here lies the danger; not in the uſe of reaſon, as ſuch, but in the abuſe of it, and in the power of ſuch affections as are ſubject to love lies better than truth, and which therefore make

make a tool and a drudge of reaſon, to ſerve their own bad ends. This is the danger, of which we warn you; and this is our manner of decrying human reaſon. We do not mean to decry a man's legs, when we warn him againſt leaping down a precipice, to break his neck. Is it not our duty to warn him? Eſpecially, if he is ſo blind as not to ſee the danger, and at the ſame time ſo conceited, as to think he ſees better than we do? Does not the Goſpel itſelf give us ſufficient warning from that deplorable caſe of the blind phariſees, whoſe ſin was fixed in them paſt recovery, becauſe they ſaid, we ſee? So that upon theſe conſiderations I venture to ſay to you, in words directly oppoſite to thoſe of your Socinian counſellor, "Diſtruſt all thoſe who magnify human reaſon:" the devil did it in paradiſe; the blind phariſees did it; and our Deiſts and Socinians do it, at this day, to the infinite prejudice of thoſe who are weak enough to liſten to them. Beſides, it is proper to advertiſe to you, in moſt of our modern diſcourſes about reaſon, there is an ambiguity, which it is of the utmoſt conſequence to remove. Reaſon has two meanings: it ſignifies the intuitive faculty, or power of reaſon, in the human mind; and it alſo ſignifies truth of argument, independent of the mind. Theſe two differ from each other as a man's feet differ from the road that he travels upon: the road may be a good road, lying ſtraight before him; and this is what we call right reaſon; but if he is lame, he cannot get forward; if the road is rough, and he is tender-footed, he will diſlike it; and if he is whimſical or obſtinate, he will go another way, to ſhew people that he underſtands the road better than you do.

How very wrong is it to affirm, as this author does, "that there is no poſſibility of replying to the Papiſts, in their doctrine of tranſubſtantiation, but by appealing to reaſon." What! ſhall we be ſo raſh as to allow the Papiſts the authority of the Scripture, out of a compliment to our own reaſon? And ſhall we be ſo ignorant as to do this, in a matter where the Scripture expreſsly confutes them? Chriſt informed the Jews, that they muſt "eat his fleſh, and drink "his blood." They were ſhocked at this, as a thing un-

natural; and our Saviour proved it to be impoſſible, by obſerving to them, that they ſhould ſee him aſcend into heaven, where his perſon ſhould be out of their reach. Therefore to reconcile all this, and ſhew the meaning, he added, "The fleſh profiteth nothing; the words that I ſpeak unto "you, they are ſpirit, and they are life." So that the Papiſts are inexcuſable for following the example of the blinded Jews, and taking his expreſſions in a bodily ſenſe. Thus then we may reply to the Papiſts out of that Scripture which they allow; and it is better than to appeal to reaſon; for if by reaſon we mean human reaſon, as this man does, then our reaſon is no rule to theirs: but if by reaſon we mean right reaſon, or truth of argument, then that truth, in ſcriptural ſubjects, is to be laid down from the Scripture: and, in my opinion, this author has acted neither wiſely, nor like a Proteſtant, in giving it up to the Papiſts.

He ſets out to argue with a Mahometan, in the ſame abſurd manner. You muſt bid the Mahometan uſe his reaſon, and then he cannot but ſee that our religion is better than his. This is a very eaſy method to convert the Mahometan: we can bid him uſe his reaſon with very little trouble to ourſelves: but, I pray, who muſt enable him to do it? For he is in blindneſs, and bondage of mind, under the corrupting doctrines in which he has been educated. It was foretold of the Jews, that they ſhould be "ſmitten with blindneſs," and ſhould "grope, at noon-day, as the blind gropeth in "darkneſs." They are now in this ſtate, the ſlaves of paſſion, prejudice, intereſt, and diſaffection: and what are we to do with them? We muſt ſend our author to them, and he will bid them uſe their reaſon. But if we ſend a Chriſtian to them, who has read his Bible, he will bid them pray to God for that faith which is his gift, and reſign themſelves to be directed by him, as St. Paul, their pattern, did, before the ſcales of Jewiſh blindneſs fell from his eyes. When Paul was under the prejudices of a Jew, God did not bid him uſe his reaſon, but ſtruck him to the earth by the force of a light from heaven, which brought him to a ſenſe of his own blindneſs; and that brought him to his prayers;

and

and then another miracle opened his eyes; which all the reaſoning in the world would never have effected, without the interpoſition of divine grace; and yet this Paul never was ſo far from the Goſpel as the Socinian is: Theſe things are ſufficient to ſhew that reaſon, in the ſtate it now is, cannot lead us to God; and that, by itſelf, it is no ſufficient guide in matters of religion. You will aſk, how then am I to judge of the ſenſe of Scripture? Am I not to depend upon my reaſon? The Apoſtle ſays not; for that the Scriptures are able to make us wiſe unto ſalvation "through faith "that is in Chriſt Jeſus." Of this faith our author ſays not a ſingle word: he does not ſeem to know of ſuch a principle; though the juſt live by it, and the Scriptures are full of it. How does it happen that the Jew knows nothing of the Scripture, but becauſe he is deſtitute of this principle? Though the Socinians are of opinion that the Jews have always been right in the firſt and great commandment, and the Chriſtian church always wrong, in the ſame, from the beginning. Such is the perſuaſion of theſe men of reaſon!

CHAP. V.

OF THE POWER OF MAN TO DO THE WILL OF GOD.

THIS propoſition, that man has power of himſelf to do the will of God, is repugnant to the whole Goſpel; and eſpecially to that declaration of Chriſt, "Without me ye "can do nothing:" yet, for this propoſition, our Socinian has ſoberly pleaded; attempting to prove it from thoſe words of the Scripture, where God ſaith to the people, "Turn "ye from your evil ways; why will ye die, O houſe of "Iſrael?" Hence he argues, that the people had power to turn themſelves, otherwiſe God would not have required it. But unleſs we are to take the Scripture by halves, we ſhall find it ſaid by the people, and by their prophets, "Turn "thou us unto thee, O Lord, and we ſhall be turned" Lam. v. 21, and Jer. xxxi. 18. So that if both theſe

ſages are laid together, it follows, that in the great work of converſion, there is a part for man, and a part for God; as in that exhortation of the Apoſtle, "Work out your own ſalvation with fear and trembling; for it is God that worketh in you, both to will and to do, of his good pleaſure." Phil. ii. 12, 13. There was a man who came to our Saviour with a withered hand, of which he had loſt the uſe: yet Chriſt ſaid unto him, "Stretch forth thine hand." On this occaſion our author might argue, that Chriſt did not heal this man, for that he muſt have had the uſe of his hand, otherwiſe he would not have been commanded to ſtretch it out. But this would be very ſuperficial reaſoning; for the man, in faith and obedience to the word of Chriſt, attempted to ſtretch forth his hand, and in the attempt received that power which was neceſſary to effect it. It is juſt ſo with us; and, without queſtion, the miracle was deſigned to illuſtrate our own caſe. God commands us, with our withered faculties, to do his will: we endeavour to do it; and, in the attempt, receive that ability which is neceſſary to accompliſh it. In all theſe caſes the will of man, and the power of God, operate together. We turn ourſelves, and God turneth us: the man ſtretched out his hand, and Chriſt ſtretched it out for him: we work out our ſalvation, and God worketh in us at the ſame time. This is what appears, when we lay the Scripture together: and you ſee how dangerous it is to liſten to thoſe who argue from a ſcrap of the Bible, miſunderſtood and perverted, ſo as to render the grace of God of none effect.

"Power in man to do the will of God," ſays the author, "is no foundation for pride; for what have we that we have not received?" The queſtion really is, whether we have this power by nature, independent of the Goſpel, or whether it is given to us in conſequence of the Goſpel? Certainly not by nature; God having purpoſely ſo ordered things, "that the excellency of the power may be of God, "and not of us." 2 Cor. iv. 7. If all is right in us by nature, and we have within ourſelves the power by which we are to be ſaved, then there are no works of the devil to

be

be deſtroyed, and Chriſt need not have come into the world. But then it is objected, that if God help us by the miraculous powers of his grace, this doctrine muſt encourage us to preſumption, and to put off our reformation in hope of ſome future ſudden converſion. To be ſure it may do this: and ſo may all the doctrines of the Goſpel be abuſed, when they fall into bad hands. Some were ſo perverſe as to argue in favour of an abundance of ſin, that the grace of God might abound in forgiving it: but the Apoſtle did not therefore withdraw his doctrine of juſtification by faith in Chriſt: he ſtated the caſe, corrected the abuſe, and left his doctrine in poſſeſſion, as before. So muſt we do now: if any ill uſe be made of the Goſpel, we muſt not give the Goſpel up, but demonſtrate the abuſe, and correct it, from the Goſpel itſelf.

CHAP. VI.

OF ORIGINAL SIN.

IN this chapter, the author allows that we ſuffer by the ſin of Adam, but ſays it is impoſſible we ſhould have ſinned in him. Whether we have ſinned after the ſimilitude of Adam's tranſgreſſion, and how far his individual offence may be ours, is a nice queſtion: but the doctrine of original ſin may be ſettled without it.—If, in conſequence of Adam's tranſgreſſion, we have derived from him a conſtitution, of which ſin is the natural fruit, then ſin is original in human nature, and comes into the world with us; as the leproſy or gout may be original in thoſe who derive it from their parents, and bring the ſeeds of theſe diſtempers into the world with them. If nothing but death had entered into the world by means of Adam's offence, the doctrine might have been doubtful: but the Apoſtle teaches us, that when death entered into the world, ſin entered with it; and that "death "has paſſed upon all men, for that all have ſinned:" the effect is permanent in our ſuffering, as the cauſe is permanent

nent in our conſtitution. The Apoſtle therefore perſiſts to ſpeak of mankind as being under the law of ſin and death; not of death only, but of ſin alſo; and that the law of the ſpirit of life in Chriſt Jeſus hath made them free from both. The name given to the ſinful nature of man is that of fleſh, in oppoſition to the renewed ſpirit of a Chriſtian. "I "know," ſays the Apoſtle, "that in me" (that is, in my fleſh) "dwelleth no good thing:" and in the verſe before, he ſpeaks of ſin dwelling in him. At laſt he exclaims, "O "wretched man that I am! who ſhall deliver me from the "body of this death?" This fleſh, this body of ſin, this body of death, which is alſo called the old man, and is pronounced to be corrupt, are ſo many expreſſions, affirming that ſin is original in man's nature. And if there were no other proof of it in the Bible, this conſideration alone would be ſufficient, that none can enter into the kingdom of God, unleſs he is born again: for there can be no occaſion to ſave us, by a new birth, unleſs we are loſt by the old,

CHAP. VII.

OF ELECTION AND REPROBATION.

HOW far the decrees of God are arbitrary, is a queſtion, about which we might multiply words to little purpoſe; and, if we ſhould calculate how many of the human race will be ſaved, and how many will be loſt, we ſhould employ ourſelves to as little effect. There is only one thing here to be obſerved. Our author affirms, that "as ſurely as we derive our being from a juſt and merciful God, the terms on which we come into the world are advantageous to us." This muſt undoubtedly be true, ſo far as the Creator himſelf is the cauſe of our preſent ſtate: but it is very mean logic which argues, that becauſe God is juſt and merciful, man is on the ſame terms now, as when he was firſt created: for this is but to ſay, in other words, that becauſe God is juſt and merciful, therefore he hath lied to us, in his account of

the

the fall and its conſequences. Neither do theſe give us any ground of complaint, againſt the juſtice and mercy of God; for, he removed from himſelf the beginning of all evil and vanity into the liberty of the creature; as he hath reſerved in himſelf the beginning of all reſtitution to the liberty of his grace; in virtue of which liberty, he calleth whom he pleaſes, at what time he pleaſes, and "divideth to every "man ſeverally as he will." This liberty of calling, and diſtributing, our author diſputes with him; affirming, that we certainly (as ſure as God is juſt) come into the world on advantageous terms, and enjoy theſe terms without being called to them. But, the Scripture, which is of better authority, informs us, that God "added to his church ſuch "as ſhould be ſaved;" and that all the members of it are elected to the divine privilege of being fellow-heirs with Jeſus Chriſt; to which they certainly have no right by nature. The gifts and calling of God are mentioned together; becauſe it is merely of his free gift that we Gentiles have been called to the terms of his holy religion. The God, who called Abraham from his country and kindred, and afterwards called the Gentiles, throughout the world, by the miniſtry of his Apoſtles, granting them repentance unto life, hath, by the ſame act of grace, entitled us to the benefits of the evangelical charter: and when we are no longer worthy of our vocation, he may diſfranchiſe us; or, to uſe the language of the Apoſtle, he that grafted us into his church, may cut us off from it, and reject us, as he hath actually rejected the Jews, for an example to us. It is now as poſſible for a man to forfeit his ſtation under the Goſpel, as it was for Adam to forfeit Paradiſe: and the ready way to this is proudly to arrogate ſuch rights as we have not; for thus the Jews did. They boaſted that they had "Abra-"ham for their father," and were "never in bondage." So the Socinian boaſts, that he is born to terms of advantage, and denies that he is under the bondage of ſin: and therefore, by his own account of himſelf, he has no need of the Goſpel; for the Goſpel offers itſelf as a light to the blind, a help to the weak, a medicine to the ſick, and life to the dead.

CHAP.

CHAP. VIII.

OF THE DIVINITY OF CHRIST.

IT would take up too much room to examine and ſettle all the texts our author has perverted; neither is there any occaſion for it. His doctrine will very ſoon be overturned. "If you aſk," ſays he, "Who then is Jeſus Chriſt, if he be not God? I anſwer in the words of St. Peter, addreſſed to the Jews, after his reſurrection and aſcenſion, that Jeſus of Nazareth was a man approved of God, &c. and man muſt mean the ſame kind of being with ourſelves." The taſk therefore which he impoſes upon you, is only this; that when you find Jeſus of Nazareth called "our Lord and "Saviour Jeſus Chriſt, our God and Saviour Jeſus Chriſt, "God manifeſt in the fleſh, Jehovah our righteouſneſs, the "mighty God, the everlaſting Father, the Alpha and Omega, "the firſt and the laſt, the Sun of Righteouſneſs, the Prince "of Life, the Lord of Glory, by whom all things in "heaven and earth were created, and by whom they now "conſiſt, in whoſe perſon there was God reconciling the "world to himſelf, even all the fulneſs of the Godhead "bodily;" I ſay, when you read theſe, and numberleſs other expreſſions to the ſame effect, you are to find ways of bringing them down to ſuch a ſenſe, as to leave nothing in them all, but Jeſus of Nazareth, a being of the ſame kind with yourſelves. My brethren, if you think this can be done, then you are too far gone for me to reclaim you. If you think it cannot, then you ſee the grand error of Socinianiſm, and I need give you no farther trouble on this part of our ſubject.

CHAP.

CHAP. IX.

OF ATONEMENT FOR SIN BY THE DEATH OF CHRIST.

AS the Socinians deny the fall of man, they cannot be conſiſtent, without denying all its conſequences; of which, the doctrine of atonement is one of the moſt conſiderable. And a doctrine it is, ſo plain and ſtriking, that all mankind, who have had any notion of God's purity, and their own guilt, have joined in the practice of offering ſacrifices, to avert the wrath of inviſible powers; thus giving univerſal teſtimony to that great principle of the Law and the Goſpel, that without ſhedding of blood there is no remiſſion. And this general attachment to the notion of expiation diſpoſed the Gentiles to embrace the ſacrifice of Chriſt, in whom they found that atonement, which they had all deſired; and therefore the prophet ſcrupled not to call him "the deſire of all nations." But, in this capacity, he is not deſirable to the Socinians, who have found out another way of acceptance. They hold, that nothing is neceſſary, but mere repentance and moral reformation, on the part of ſinners; and that God, on his part, is bound by his goodneſs, to forgive them, for nothing. But now, what are we to do with all thoſe declarations of the Scripture, which ſpeak of Jeſus Chriſt, as a "ſacrifice for ſin?" In anſwer to which, I may venture to aſſure you, that the ſame ingenuity, which proves Jeſus Chriſt to be "no more than a man," can as eaſily prove, that he was no ſacrifice. It is true, ſay they, he is called a ſacrifice, but only in a figurative expreſſion, as our prayers and praiſes are called ſacrifices. His death was no ſin-offering, but only an example of patient ſuffering for his religion; an example to us to ſuffer in like manner, if we are called upon; and this, ſays our author, in his canting way, "was a noble ſacrifice indeed." So that a noble ſacrifice is no ſacrifice at all. And now, my brethren, is not this a noble way of interpreting the Scripture? Chriſt died for our ſins: and

what does it mean? Nothing at all, but that he died for his own religion! And, if we die in like manner, then we are as truly a ſacrifice for him, as he was for us:—and ſo ſaith the Quaker, that "the blood of Chriſt was no more than the blood of any other ſaint *." But what ſaith the Scripture? "Chriſt our Paſſover is ſacrificed for us." Did not the Paſſover and its blood ſtop the execution of that vengeance, which fell upon the Egyptians? If Chriſt then is our Paſſover, it muſt follow, that his blood now does for us, what the blood of the paſcal lamb did for the Hebrews in Egypt: but that blood was expiatory, and carried redemption from death with it: and therefore ſo is his; according to that of St. Paul, "We have redemption through his "blood, even the forgiveneſs of our ſins." Was the Paſſover an example to the Hebrews? Did it die for its own religion? No; its blood was accepted for the ſaving of the people of God, when the unbelieving were deſtroyed; and therefore Chriſt's blood, as the great antitype before referred to, is accepted for the ſame end: otherwiſe he can be no Paſſover. Indeed, ſo falſe is it that Chriſt's ſacrifice was figurative, that there never was any true and proper ſacrifice, but his only. The "blood of bulls, and of goats, and of "lambs," which were offered daily, under the Law, and had the appearance of real ſacrifices, could not accompliſh what it aimed at: it could not purge the conſcience from a ſenſe of guilt: and to ſhew that it had not done ſo, thoſe ſacrifices were offered repeatedly, day by day, and year by year: but Chriſt offered himſelf "once for all," and, by that offering, "perfected for ever them that are ſanctified." With the merits of this ſacrifice, he now appears, as our High Prieſt, in the preſence of God for us, as the High Prieſt of the Jews went into the moſt holy place of the temple, once a year, with the blood of the yearly ſacrifice. We are far from denying, that Chriſt was an example to us in his death, as well as in his life: but he was not only an example, as the Socinian falſely aſſerts; he was an "Inter-

* G. Keith quoted theſe words from Solomon Eccles, a great preacher and prophet of the Quakers. See Leſlie's Works, folio, Vol. II. p. 195.

" ceſſor, a Mediator, a temple, a Prieſt, a ſacrifice, a ran-
" ſom, a price of redemption, a propitiation, an atonement,
" a lamb ſlain for the ſins of the world * :" he was, in ſhort, all that the Law exhibited: and inſtead of being a ſacrifice only in figure, all the ſacrifices that had been before him, from the beginning of the world, were the figures, of which he himſelf, once for all, in the end of the world, was the ſubſtance and reality.

If you wiſh to ſee the whole doctrine of atonement confirmed and explained in a ſingle text, conſider what the Apoſtle hath ſaid, Heb. x. 26, 27. " If we ſin wilfully,
" after that we have received the knowledge of the truth,
" there remaineth no more ſacrifice for ſins, but a certain
" fearful looking for of judgment, and fiery indignation,
" which ſhall devour the adverſaries." This teaches us, that a fire from heaven is due to ſinners, and muſt fall upon thoſe ſinners themſelves, unleſs a ſacrifice, expoſing itſelf in their ſtead, ſhall turn away the indignation that awaits them. Chriſt is this ſacrifice, accepted of God as our ſubſtitute: but, if we depart from our profeſſion, deſpiſing the advantage of this ſubſtitution, then we can find no other ſacrifice, but muſt receive the divine wrath in our own perſons. When God ſhall be revealed, as once on Mount Sinai, and that fiery indignation, which is looked for, ſhall be falling upon the adverſaries of the Goſpel, then we ſhall ſee the neceſſity of this ſacrifice for ſin: and, if the ſophiſtry of any ſeducer ſhall have tempted us to rely on ſome other method of ſalvation, we ſhall curſe the hour, in which we liſtened to him.

CHAP. X.

CONCLUSION.

YOU are not to wonder, my brethren, either at the abſurdity, or wickedneſs, of theſe attempts which are made upon your faith: the Scripture hath told us, the time ſhould

* Heb. vii. 25. Ibid. ix. 15. John ii. 21. Heb. iv. 14. Ibid. ix. 26. Matt. xx. 28. 1 Cor. vi. 20. 1 John ii. 2. Rom. v. 11. John i. 29.

come,

come, when they "will not endure ſound doctrine," but be poſſeſſed with an itch of novelty: and, as numbers give credit to any falſe perſuaſion, it is natural for them to wiſh, that you may endure ſound doctrine as little as they do. With this view, they take all poſſible pains for the propagation of their falſe opinions; which Dr. Prieſtley, in falſe Engliſh, calls the "ſpread of truth *." Theſe opinions, as you have ſeen, are very flattering to human pride: and it is an old ſaying, that flatterers are eaſily believed. No deep reaſoning is requiſite, when the treachery of your own hearts aſſiſts them in their work; the ſucceſs of which is farther promoted by the cheapneſs of their publications, which puts them into the hands of the loweſt readers. Their books fly about the world, at a penny a-piece; like the ſeeds of thiſtles, which, being little and light, are carried about by the winds, and will take root in any ſoil, (the worſe the better) till they overrun the face of the earth; and this they call the "ſpread of truth." O let not the huſbandman go to ſleep, while the enemy is thus diligent, and ſucceſsful! You may judge, therefore, that your ſituation is dangerous; and when you are convinced of this, it is hoped, you will be on your guard. And now I have endeavoured, as my duty requires, to ſhew you what the enemies of your faith have to ſay, in one of their pieces, you may be able to judge of the reſt for yourſelves. So, for the preſent, I ſhall conclude with that advice of St. John—"Beloved, "believe not every ſpirit, but try the ſpirits, whether they "are of God: becauſe many falſe prophets are gone out "into the world." 1 John iv. 1.

* See the Preface to his Sermon on "The Importance and Extent of free Enquiry into Matters of Religion."

THE CATHOLIC DOCTRINE OF A TRINITY

Proved by above an

Hundred ſhort and clear ARGUMENTS, expreſſed in the TERMS of the

HOLY SCRIPTURE,

Compared after a Manner entirely New,

AND

Digeſted under the Four following TITLES:

1. The Divinity of *Chriſt.*
2. The Divinity of the *Holy Ghoſt.*
3. The *Plurality* of Perſons.
4. The Trinity in Unity.

With a few REFLECTIONS, occaſionally interſperſed, upon ſome of the ARIAN WRITERS, particularly Dr. S. CLARKE:

To which is added,

A LETTER to the COMMON PEOPLE, in Anſwer to ſome POPULAR ARGUMENTS againſt THE TRINITY.

BY WILLIAM JONES, M.A. F.R.S.

RECTOR OF PASTON, IN NORTHAMPTONSHIRE, AND MINISTER OF NAYLAND, IN SUFFOLK.

PREFACE

TO THE

THIRD EDITION.

MY Bookſeller having ſolicited me to re-publiſh this little Treatiſe, I have corrected the typographical errors of the laſt edition, and enlarged ſome paſſages of the work itſelf.

THE attempt of a late Biſhop of Clogher to propagate *Arianiſm* in the Church of *Ireland*, induced me to keep the doctrine of the *Trinity* in my thoughts for ſome years; and I had a particular attention to it as often as the Scriptures, either of the Old or New Teſtament, were before me. This little book was the fruit of my ſtudy; of which I have ſeen ſome good effects already, and ought not to deſpair of ſeeing more before I die.

MANY other obſervations have occurred to me ſince the firſt publication, which I ſhould willingly have added. But ſome readers might have been diſcouraged, if I had preſented them with a book

of too large a ſize: and the merits of the cauſe lie in a ſmall compaſs.

THE re-publication of this work, though merely accidental, is not unſeaſonable at this time, when we are taught from the preſs *, (and the author ſeems to be very much in earneſt) that the only ſure way of reducing Chriſtianity to its primitive purity, is to aboliſh all *Creeds* and *Articles*. But the great rock of offence with this writer, is the *Trinity*; to get rid of which, he would at once diſſolve our whole eccleſiaſtical conſtitution, and form of worſhip.

THIS wild project furniſhes a melancholy confirmation of the cenſure paſſed upon us by ſome learned Proteſtants abroad, who have reflected upon *England* as a country productive of literary monſters †; where ſome old hereſy is frequently riſing up, as old comets have been ſuppoſed to do, with new and portentous appearances. And the reader whoſe ſight can penetrate through the vehement accuſations of *popery*, *bigotry*, *perſecution*, *impoſition*, and other fiery vapours with which this author hath ſurrounded his performance, will diſcover little, if any thing, more than *Arianiſm* at the centre.

THE Scripture is the only rule that can enable us to judge whether that or the Catholic doctrine of the Trinity is more agreeable to truth: there-

* In a new work, intitled *The Confeſſional*.

† *Carpzov.* Pref. in Pſeudo Critic: *Whiſtonii.*

fore

fore I have confined myſelf to this unexceptionable kind of evidence for the proof of the latter, and have made the Scripture *its own interpreter*. But our adverſaries, though they allow the ſufficiency of the Scripture, and unjuſtly pretend to diſtinguiſh themſelves from us by inſiſting upon it, do nevertheleſs make ſuch frequent uſe of a lower ſort of evidence to bias common readers, and ſhew the expediency of what they are pleaſed to call *Reformation*; that I have thought proper to exhibit a ſpecimen of their method of proceeding in that reſpect, by adding to this edition *A Letter to the Common People, in anſwer to ſome popular Arguments againſt the Trinity*. Theſe arguments are extracted chiefly from a ſmall book, intitled, *An Appeal to the Common Senſe of all Chriſtian People*; a thing very highly commended by the author of the *Confeſſional**. But in this author's eſtimation, every writer that oppoſes the faith of the Church of *England*, is *ipſo facto* invincible: and conſequently, this retailer of Dr. *Clarke*'s opinions, whoever he

* "Which book," (ſays he) "has paſſed through two editions without any ſort of reply that I have heard of. This looks as if *able* writers were not *willing* to meddle with the ſubject, or that *willing* writers were not *able* to manage it," p. 330. The Rev. Mr. *Landon* publiſhed an anſwer to this book in 1764, printed for *Whiſton* and *White*: and he has mentioned another himſelf in a *note*. But had the caſe really been as he hath reported in his text, it will by no means follow, that a book is therefore unanſwerable, becauſe it hath received no anſwer. If this be good logic, I could preſent him with a concluſion or two, which he would not very well like.

is, muſt come in for his ſhare of merit and applauſe; which I by no means envy him.

So far as the Scripture itſelf hath been thought to furniſh any objections to the received doctrine, I judged it the fairer and the ſurer way to anſwer them as they were offered by Dr. *Clarke* himſelf, and have therefore no apology to make for neglecting ſome of his diſciples, who have not made any improvement on his arguments, as I do not find that this gentleman hath: the ſecond edition of whoſe Appeal was publiſhed in 1754, ſince which there have been two editions of the *Catholic Doctrine* in *England*, and one or more in *Ireland*.

By all the obſervations I have been able to make, the greater number of thoſe who diſbelieve the Trinity upon principle, (for many do it implicitly, and are credulous in their unbelief) do not profeſs to take their notions of God from the Bible, but affect to diſtinguiſh themſelves from the common herd, by drawing them from the fountains of Reaſon and Philoſophy. We cannot be perſuaded that the Trinity is denied by reaſoners of this complexion, becauſe the Scripture hath *not revealed* it: but do rather ſuſpect that ſome philoſophers diſſent from this point of Chriſtian doctrine, becauſe they are not humble enough to take the Scripture as a teſt of their religious opinions. In which caſe the whole labour of collecting of texts, and framing of comments, and fiſhing for various readings, is an after-thought. It is ſubmitted to rather for apology

logy than for proof: to reconcile readers of the Scripture to that doctrine which they would be more jealous of receiving if they knew it to have been originally borrowed from another quarter. He that would deceive a *Chriſtian*, can ſeldom do his work effectually without a Bible in his hand: a conſideration which may help us to a ſight of the conſequences, if perſons were permitted to teach in our churches without any previous enquiry concerning their religious ſentiments, and ſo allowed to take the ſame liberty, either through miſtake or ill deſign, as was taken by the arch-deceiver in the wilderneſs *, who never meant to uſe the Scripture for edification, but only for deſtruction; not to apply it as an inſtrument of good, but to turn it, as far as he was able, into an inſtrument of evil. The Bible was given us for the preſervation of the kingdom of Chriſt upon earth; as the Book of Statutes in this kingdom is intended to ſecure the authority of the government, together with the life, peace, and property, of every individual: and we want no prophet to foreſhew us the conſequences, if all the malecontents in the nation were allowed to be public interpreters of the laws.

THESE conſiderations I leave the judicious to apply as they find occaſion. I uſe them chiefly as hints, for the benefit both of ſuch as may be in danger of wreſting the Scriptures to their own deſtruction, and of ſuch philoſophers as thoſe al-

* Matt. iv. 6.

luded to by St. *Paul* *, who through the *profeſſion* of fancied *wiſdom* fell into real *folly*, and purchaſed a reputed knowledge of things natural and metaphyſical, at the lamentable expence of loſing the knowledge of God.

* Rom. i. 22. 1 Cor. i. 21.

PLUCKLEY,
Jan. 1, 1767.

TO THE

READER.

THE Chriſtian religion is beſt known and diſtinguiſhed by the God propoſed in it, as the object of our faith and obedience: and as there is no true religion, but the religion of Chriſtians, ſo is there no true God, but the God of Chriſtians.

Before the coming of *Chriſt*, and the fulfilling of the Law, God was known by the name of *Jehovah*, the God of *Abraham*, and of *Iſaac*, and of *Jacob*. The *Iſraelites*, who were the ſeed of *Abraham*, and drew their whole religion from a divine revelation, had the knowledge of the true God; and the people of every other nation, who were "aliens from "the commonwealth of Iſrael, and ſtrangers from the co-"venants of promiſe," were alſo "without God in the "world [1]." Though they talked much of God, and wrote much of him, and offered him many ſacrifices, yet they knew him not: the being they ſerved, was not God, but another in the place of him, falſely called by his name. And though ſome modern Chriſtians have forgot there was any difference, yet the very *heathens* themſelves, upon ſome occaſions, were ready enough to allow it. *Naaman* the *Syrian*, when he was cured of his leproſy by the prophet *Eliſha*, made a public confeſſion of it.—"Behold, now I "know that there is no God in all the earth, but in Iſrael [2]." The ſame is affirmed by the inſpired Pſalmiſt—"All the "gods of the heathens are idols [3];" and God himſelf declares them *all* to have been *vanities* [4].

[1] Eph. ii. 12; [2] 2 Kings v. 15. [3] Pſal. xcvi. 5. [4] Jer. xiv. 22.

The

The caſe is now with the *Chriſtians* under the Goſpel, as it anciently was with the *Jews* under the Law: they believe in the only true God; while the unchriſtian part of mankind, who are by far the majority, either know him not, or wilfully deny him; as *Pharaoh* did the *God of the Hebrews* when he was told of him. And we are now got to ſuch a pitch of indevotion and ignorance, that among thoſe who profeſs and call themſelves *Chriſtians*, there are too many who are almoſt come to be *Heathens* without knowing it. For there is a faſhionable notion propagated by moſt of our moral writers, and readily ſubſcribed to by thoſe who ſay their prayers but ſeldom, and can never find time to read their Bible, that all who worſhip any God, worſhip the *ſame* God; as if we worſhipped the three letters of the *word* God, inſtead of the *Being* meant and underſtood by it. The *Univerſal Prayer* of Mr. Alexander Pope was compoſed upon this plan; wherein the Supreme Being is addreſſed as a common *Father of all*, under the names, *Jehovah*, *Jove*, and *Lord*. And this humour of confounding things, which ought to be diſtinguiſhed at the peril of our ſouls, and of comprehending *believers* and *idolaters* under one and the ſame religion, is called a *catholic ſpirit*, that ſhews the very exaltation of Chriſtian charity. But God, it is to be feared, will require an account of it under another name; and though the *poet* could ſee no difference, but has miſtaken *Jove* or *Jupiter* for the ſame *Father of all* with the *Lord Jehovah*; yet the *Apoſtle* has inſtructed us better; who, when the *Prieſt of Jupiter* came to offer ſacrifice, exhorted him very paſſionately to "turn from thoſe vanities unto the living God[1];" well knowing that he whom the *Prieſt* adored under the name of *Jupiter*, was not the *living God*, but a creature, a nothing, a *vanity*. Yet the catholic ſpirit of a moraliſt can diſcern no difference; and while it pretends ſome zeal for a ſort of univerſal religion, common to *believers* and *infidels*, betrays a ſad indifference for the Chriſtian religion in particular. This error is ſo monſtrous in a land enlightened by the Goſpel, and yet ſo very common amongſt us at preſent,

[1] Acts xiv. 15.

that

that I may be pardoned for ſpeaking of it in the manner it deſerves. And let me beſeech every ſerious perſon, who is willing to have his prayers heard, to conſider this matter a little better, and uſe a more correct form; for God, who is jealous of his honour, and has no communion with idols, will certainly reject the petition that ſets him upon a level with *Baal* and *Jupiter*.

The *true God* is He that was "in Chriſt reconciling the "world to himſelf;" there is none other but He; and if this great characteriſtic be denied, or any other aſſumed in its ſtead, a man is left *without God*; after which, he may call himſelf a *Deiſt*, if he will; but his God is a mere idol of the imagination, and has no correſponding reality in the whole univerſe of beings.

The modern *Jews*, by denying their *God* to have been *manifeſt in the fleſh*, are as effectually departed from the *true* God, as their forefathers were, when they danced before the golden calf, and called their idolatrous ſervice "a feaſt "to the Lord." For the Being of God is not an object of ſight, but of faith; it enters firſt into the heart; and if it be wrong there, the *firſt* commandment is broken: if a figure of it be ſet up before the eyes, then the *ſecond* is broken likewiſe. The firſt forbids us to *have* any other God; the ſecond, to make any graven *image* of him. Now though we make no image, yet if with the heart we *believe* in any God different from the true, the idolatry indeed may be leſs, but the apoſtacy is the ſame. And this ſeems to be the caſe of the *Jew*.

The *Mahometans* are another ſet of infidels, who *abhor idols*, but have in expreſs terms denied the *Son of God*, and ſet up an idol of the imagination, a God in *one Perſon*. They inveigh bitterly againſt the *Chriſtians* for worſhipping *three Gods*; for ſo they ſtate the doctrine of a Trinity in *Unity*, as ſome others have done beſide them.

In anſwer to all theſe abominations of the *Deiſt*, the *Jew*, and the *Mahometan*, and to ſhew that no unbeliever of any denomination can be a ſervant of the *true God*, it is written —"who-

—" whoſoever denieth the Son, the ſame hath not the " Father [1]:" and again—" whoſoever tranſgreſſeth and " abideth not in the doctrine of *Chriſt*, hath not GOD [2]." And let the *Socinians*, who have not only vindicated the religion of *Mahomet*, but preferred it to the Chriſtianity of the church of *England*, which with them is " *no better nor other than a ſort of Paganiſm and Heatheniſm* *," let them conſider what a ſhare they have in this condemnation.

And to bring this matter home to the *Arians*; it is to be obſerved, that every article of the Chriſtian faith depends upon the doctrine of a Trinity in Unity. If that be given up, the other doctrines of our religion muſt go with it, and ſo it has been in fact, that the authors who have written againſt the Trinity, have alſo diſputed away ſome other eſſential parts of Chriſtianity; particularly the doctrines of the *ſatisfaction* and of *original ſin*.

The whole Bible treats of little elſe but our *creation, redemption, ſanctification, reſurrection, and glorification*, by the power of *Chriſt* and the *Holy Spirit:* and the reader will find hereafter, that there is neither name, act, nor attribute of the Godhead, that is not ſhared in common by all the perſons of the Trinity. If, therefore, the perſons of *Chriſt* and the *Spirit* are not *God* in the Unity of *the Father*, then the prayers and praiſes we offer to them, as the authors of every bleſſing, will not be directed to the ſupreme Lord and God, beſide whom no other is to be *worſhipped*, but to his creatures and inſtruments: which overthrows the ſenſe of our whole religion; and drives us upon a ſort of ſecond-rate faith and worſhip, which, beſide the blaſphemy of it, can be nothing but confuſion and contradiction. It is no wonder then, that the *Arians* and *Socinians*, with their ſeveral under-ſects and diviſions, who have fallen into this ſnare, and de-

[1] 1 John ii. 23. [2] 2 John 9.

* See *Leſlie*'s Theological Works, *Fol.* Vol. I. p. 218, where the reader may find a great deal more to the ſame purpoſe; and particularly an Epiſtle of the *Socinians*, to the *Morocco* Embaſſador, in the time of *Charles* II. a great curioſity, wherein their whole ſcheme is laid open to the bottom *by themſelves*.

parted from the divine *Unity*, while they pretend to be the only men who aſſert it, have never yet been able to agree in the forms of religious worſhip. Some of them allowing that *Chriſt* is to receive divine worſhip, but always with this reſerve, that the prayer tend ultimately to the perſon of *the Father*. So that *Chriſt* is to be worſhipped, only he is not to be worſhipped: and if you ſhould venture, when you are at the point of death, to ſay with St. *Stephen*—"Lord Jeſus, "receive my ſpirit [1]"—and confeſs the perſon of *Jeſus* to be "the God of the Spirits of all fleſh [2]," by committing your own ſpirit into his hands; you are to take care not to die without throwing in ſome qualifying comment, to aſſure him you do it only in hypocriſy, not meaning him but another. Others, again, knowing this diſtinction to be vain and indefenſible, and the ſame for ſubſtance with the *Latria* and *Dulia*, by which the church of *Rome* excuſes her adoration of the *bleſſed Virgin*, &c. have fairly got rid of it, by denying to the perſon of *Chriſt* any *divine* worſhip or invocation at all; which is the caſe with our *Socinian Unitarians* here in *England*; for thoſe of *Poland* are quite of another mind.

How far ſuch differences as theſe muſt needs affect a *Liturgy*, it is very eaſy to foreſee: and that it will for ever be as impoſſible to frame a Creed or a Service to pleaſe all thoſe who bear the name of *Chriſtians*, as to make a coat that ſhall fit men of all ſizes *. *Prayer* and divine *worſhip* and religious *confeſſion*, are the fruit and breath of *faith*; and "out of the abundance of the heart, the mouth ſpeaketh [3]:" ſo that until we are agreed in matters of *faith*, there is

[1] Acts vii. 59. [2] Numb. xvi. 22. [3] Matt. xii. 34.

* *Hales* of *Eton*, in his ſarcaſtic and malicious *Tract upon Schiſm*, propoſes it as a grand expedient for the advancing of *Unity*, that we ſhould "conſider "all the Liturgies, that are and ever have been; and remove from them "whatever is ſcandalous to any party, and leave nothing but what *all agree* "*on*." He ſhould have cloſed this ſentence a little ſooner; and adviſed us fairly and honeſtly to *leave nothing*; for that will certainly be the event, when the objections of *all parties* are ſuffered to prevail; there being no one page of the *Liturgy*, wherein *all*, who pretend to worſhip God as *Chriſtians*, are *agreed*.

neither

neither hope nor poſſibility of our agreeing in any form of *worſhip*. God is the fountain-head, and religion the ſtream that deſcends from it. Our ſentiments as to religion, always flow from the opinion we have formed of the divine nature; and will be right or wrong, ſweet or bitter, as the fountain is from whence they are derived. It is the having a different God, that makes a different religion. A true God produces a true religion; a falſe God, a falſe religion. *Jews*, *Turks*, *Pagans*, *Deiſts*, *Arians*, *Socinians*, and *Chriſtians*, all differ about a religion, becauſe they differ about a God.

Theſe few obſervations will be ſufficient, I hope, to raiſe the attention of the reader; and perſuade him, that a right faith in God is a much more ſerious affair than ſome would make it; that it is of the laſt concern, and hath a neceſſary influence upon the practice and holineſs of our lives; that as no other devotion is acceptable with God, but that which is ſeaſoned with love and charity and uniformity, the very mark and badge whereby his diſciples are to be known from the men of this world, it is the principal duty of every *Chriſtian* to know in *whom* he ought to *believe*, that "with one mind and one mouth we may glorify God [1]:" for a right notion of God will as ſurely be followed by a ſound faith and an uniform profeſſion in all other points; as a falſe faith and a diſcordant worſhip will grow from every wrong opinion of him.

All that can be known of the true God, is to be known by *Revelation*. The falſe lights indeed of reaſon and nature are ſet up and recommended, as neceſſary to aſſiſt and ratify the evidence of Revelation: but enquiries of this kind, as they are now managed, generally end in the degradation of *Chriſt*, and the Chriſtian religion *: till it can be ſhewn therefore that the Scripture neither does nor can ſhine by a light and authority of *its own*, the evidence we are to reſt in, muſt be drawn from thence; and as we all have the ſame

[1] Rom. xv. 6.

* You may have a proof of this from the *Eſſay on Spirit*, by comparing the book with its *title*, which runs thus—*The Doctrine of the Trinity conſidered in the Light of* Reaſon *and* Nature, &c.

Scripture,

Scripture, without doubt we ought all to have the ſame opinion of God.

But here it is commonly objected, that men will be of different opinions; that they have a right to judge for themſelves; and that when the beſt evidence the nature of the caſe will admit of is collected and laid before them, they muſt determine upon it *as it appears to them*, and according to the *light* of their own *conſciences*: ſo that if they adhere as cloſely to their errors after they have conſulted the proper evidence as they did before, we are neither to wonder nor be troubled at it.

This very moderate and benevolent way of thinking, has been ſtudiouſly recommended by thoſe, who found it neceſſary to the well-being of their own opinions, that not a ſpark of zeal ſhould be left amongſt us. And ſurely it is no new thing that the advocates of any particular error, next to themſelves and their own faſhion, ſhould naturally incline to thoſe who are ſofteſt and ſtand leaſt in the way. Hence it is, that however magiſterial and inſolent they may carry themſelves in their own cauſe; they always take care to ſeaſon their writings with the praiſes of this frozen indifference; calling that *Chriſtian* charity, which is nothing but the abſence of Chriſtianity: and any the leaſt appearance of earneſtneſs for ſome great and valuable truth, which we are unwilling to part with, becauſe we hope to be ſaved by it, is brow-beaten, condemned, and caſt out of their moral ſyſtem, under the name of *heat*, *want of temper*, *fire*, *fury*, &c. They add moreover, that articles of faith are things merely *ſpeculative*; and that it is of little ſignification what a man *believes*, if he is but hearty and *ſincere* in it: that is, in other words, it is a mere trifle whether we feed upon bread * or poiſon †; the one will prove to be as good nouriſhment as the other, provided it be eaten with an appetite. Yet ſome well-meaning people are ſo puzzled and deceived by this ſophiſtry, that they look upon concord among *Chriſtians* as a thing impracticable and deſperate; concluding a point to

* See and compare Deut. viii. 3. Amos viii. 11. Acts xx. 28.

† James iii. 8. 1 Tim. iv. 1.

be

be *diſputable* becauſe it is *diſputed*; and ſo they fall into a looſe indifferent humour of palliating and thinking charitably, as it is called, of every error in faith and practice; as if the church of *Chriſt* might very innocently be turned into a *Babel* of confuſion.

Now that men do maintain opinions ſtrangely different from one another, eſpecially on ſubjects wherein it moſt concerns them to be agreed, is readily confeſſed: we are all witneſſes of it: and, allowing them to be equally informed, there are but three poſſible ſources from whence this difference can ariſe. It muſt be either from God, or from the Scripture, or from themſelves. From God it cannot be, for it is a great evil; it is the triumph of Deiſts and reprobates, and the beſt handle the enemies of Chriſtianity ever found againſt it: and God is not the author of evil. Nor can it be from the Scripture: to draw it thence, is but another way of imputing it to God. The Scripture is his word; and he is anſwerable for the effect of his words when written or reported, as when they are ſuggeſted at firſt hand by the voice of his Holy Spirit. It remains therefore, that the only ſource of this evil muſt be the heart of man: and that it really is ſo, will be evident from the Scripture, and the plaineſt matters of fact. The account we have of this affair is, in ſhort, as follows—Ever ſince the *fall*, the nature of man has been blind and corrupt; his "underſtanding "darkened [1]," and his affections polluted: upon the face of the whole earth there is no man, *Jew* or *Gentile*, that "under-"ſtandeth and ſeeketh after God [2];" the *natural man*, or man remaining in that ſtate wherein the fall left him, is ſo far from being able to diſcover or know any religious truth, that he hates and flies from it when it is propoſed to him; he "receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God [3]." Man is natural and earthly; the things of God are ſpiritual and heavenly; and theſe are contrary one to the other: therefore, as the "wiſdom of this world is fooliſhneſs with "God [4]," ſo the wiſdom of God is fooliſhneſs with the

[1] Epheſ. iv. 18. [2] Rom. iii. 11. [3] 1 Cor. ii. 14. [4] Ibid. iii. 19.

world.

world. In a word, the ſenſe man is now poſſeſſed of, where God does not reſtrain it, is uſed for evil and not for good: his "wiſdom is earthly, ſenſual *, deviliſh [1];" it is the ſagacity of a brute [2], animated by the malignity of an evil ſpirit.

This being the preſent ſtate of man, the Scripture does therefore declare it neceſſary, that he ſhould be "transformed "by the renewing of his mind [3]," and reſtored to that "ſound mind [4]," and "light of the underſtanding [5]," that "ſpiritual diſcernment [6]," with which the human nature was endued when it came from the hands of God, but to which it has been *dead* from the *day* that evil was brought into the world. And where the grace of God that ſhould open the eyes, and prepare the heart to receive inſtruction [7], has been obſtinately withſtood and reſiſted; this blindneſs, which at firſt was only *natural*, becomes *judicial*; from being a defect, it is confirmed into a judgment; and men are not only unable to diſcern the truth; but are ſettled and rivetted in error: which is the caſe with all thoſe to whom "God "ſends ſtrong deluſion that they ſhould believe a lie, and "have pleaſure in unrighteouſneſs [8]. It is then they ſit down in the "ſeat of the ſcornful," as "fools" that "make "a mock at ſin [9]," and "deſpiſers of thoſe that are good [1];" hating and railing at their fellow-creatures, only becauſe they are endued with the fear of God! This is the laſt ſtage of blindneſs; and it is referred to in thoſe words of the Apoſtle—"If our Goſpel be hid, it is hid to them that are "loſt [2]:" as alſo in that lamentation of our bleſſed Lord over the city of *Jeruſalem*.—"If thou hadſt known, even "thou, at leaſt in this thy day, the things that belong to "thy peace! but now they are hid from thine eyes [3]."

The abſolute neceſſity of God's grace to *lighten our darkneſs*, has often been largely and faithfully inſiſted upon by the writers and preachers of the church of *England*: but

* ψυχικὸς, Natural.

[1] James iii. 15. [2] Jude 10. [3] Rom. xii. 2. [4] 2 Tim. i. 7. [5] Eph. i. 18. [6] 1 Cor. ii. 14. [7] Prov. xx. 12. and xvi. 1. [8] 2 Theſſ. ii. 11. [9] Prov. xiv. 9. [1] 2 Tim. iii. 3. [2] 2 Cor. iv. 3. [3] Luke xix. 42.

ſince a ſpirit of *Deiſm* has crept in among us, it has been openly ſlighted and contemned by ſome, and too much neglected by others; which has given an opportunity to ſeveral ſorts of enthuſiaſts to make a wrong uſe of it: ſuch as our *Quakers*, *Methodiſts*, and particularly the Reverend Mr. *William Law*, who, after writing ſo excellently upon the vanity of the world, and the follies of human life, (on which ſubjects he has no ſuperior) has left us nothing to depend upon but *imagination*, and reduced the whole evidence of Chriſtianity to fancied impulſes and inſpiration; ſo as to render the Scriptures uſeleſs, and the appointed *means* of grace contemptible. I have obſerved the like to have happened in many other inſtances; that where any eſſential point of doctrine has been dropt by the writers of the church, or at leaſt not brought out to view ſo often as it ſhould have been, it has been taken up by others, (as all *tares* are ſown while the huſbandmen are *aſleep*) and employed, under ſome falſe ſtate of it, to the no ſmall diſadvantage of the church and the Chriſtian religion.

To illuſtrate this ſubject a little farther, I ſhall make it appear by a few plain examples, that where mankind have been divided in their opinions with regard to any divine truth, it has not been owing to the ambiguity of its terms, or the defect of its evidence, but wholly and ſolely to the ſtate and temper of the hearers. And thus *Chriſt* himſelf has inſtructed us in his parable of the *ſower*; that where the good ſeed of the word periſhes, it is to be imputed to the *ground* and not to the *ſeed*. How elſe can we account for it, that when St. *Paul* laid the evidence of the Goſpel before a large aſſembly of *Jews* at *Rome*, "ſome believed the things "which were ſpoken, and ſome believed not [1]," though the ſame things were ſpoken to all? Such in general was the ſucceſs of the apoſtolical preaching; ſome few "receiving "the word with gladneſs," while others oppoſed themſelves and blaſphemed. And though it be ſuppoſed, that *words* are more eaſily miſunderſtood than *facts*, and may admit of a greater latitude; yet *here* we ſhall find, that the ſame

[1] Acts xxviii. 24.

ſpirit

ſpirit which has divided mankind in what are called the more ſpeculative points of faith, will alſo divide them in the plaineſt and moſt ſtriking matters of fact. The reſurrection of *Lazarus* was a matter of fact, ſeen and atteſted by a competent number of witneſſes: but how different was the effect of it upon different perſons! for while it had its free courſe with many of the *Jews*, and moved them to *believe on Jeſus*, it only moved *the chief Prieſts* to hate him the more; and they conſulted how "they might put Lazarus alſo to death[1]." When *Jeſus* cured the blind, and caſt out devils, ſome rightly concluded—"Rabbi, thou art a teacher come from God; for "no man can do theſe miracles that thou doſt, except God "be with him[2]:" yet there were not a few, and they of the moſt learned and knowing too, who concluded far otherwiſe, that he "caſt out devils by Beelzebub the prince of "the devils[3]." So likewiſe, when the Holy Ghoſt deſcended on the Apoſtles, and inſpired them with the gift of tongues, ſome *devout men* were amazed and confounded at the miracle; plainly ſeeing the hand of God in it, and aſking what it *meant*, what was the end and deſign of it? and being informed by St. *Peter*'s diſcourſe, that it was to confirm the miſſion of "Jeſus of Nazareth, received his word "gladly, and were baptized[4];" while *others*, to avoid the concluſion, "mocking, ſaid, theſe men are full of new "wine[5]." Here is a great multitude aſſembled together; all of them witneſſes to the ſame fact: yet, in their *opinions* of it, they are as far aſunder as drunkenneſs is from inſpiration. But in this caſe no Chriſtian will raiſe a doubt about the *real* inſpiration of the Apoſtles, or deny the power of God to have been ſufficiently manifeſted, becauſe ſome were ſo profane and ſenſeleſs as to ridicule it, under the name of drunkenneſs.

This ſelf-deceit always operates by the aſſiſtance of ſome falſe principle contrary to the Scripture; which gets poſſeſſion of the heart by miniſtering to the paſſions. And till

[1] John xii. 10, 11. [2] John iii. 2. [3] Matt. xii. 24. [4] Acts ii. 41. [5] Acts v. 13.

that be diſpoſſeſſed, no truth will be ſuffered to enter which can in the leaſt affect or deſtroy it. A man in ſuch circumſtances may ſee the truth ſtaring him in the face; and the clearer he ſees it, the more he will be enraged at it. He may be convicted, and left without a word to ſay, but what will expoſe the hardneſs and perplexity of his heart; but till it be emptied of its evil treaſure, and he becomes as a little child that has nothing of *its own* to oppoſe to the revelation of God, he cannot be *converted*; but will either ſhut his eyes, and deny the evidence that is offered to him, or pretend it is a *nice point*, very difficult to be underſtood; and ſo give a perverſe turn to it, though it be ever ſo plain and intelligible.

Till the diſciples of *Chriſt* reſigned themſelves up to be led into all truth by the teaching of the Holy Spirit, they were in the ſtate of mind I am now deſcribing; dull of hearing, and doubtful, and ſlow of heart. They were often warned of it, particularly in the following words:—"I have "yet many things to ſay unto you, but ye cannot bear them "now[1]." And as the divine wiſdom made choice of ſuch men for the good of thoſe who ſhould come after, ſo theſe things are written of them for our admonition. They had laid it down as a firſt principle, that their maſter's kingdom was to be *of this world:* and formed all their reaſonings and expectations accordingly. One was to *ſit at his right hand*, another *at his left*; and they were ever diſputing which ſhould be *the greateſt*. Any occurrence that flattered this notion, was gladly received, and made the moſt of; and every thing that could not be reconciled with it, was thruſt out of ſight. "When the Son of man began to teach them, "that he muſt ſuffer many things, and be rejected of the "elders, and of the chief prieſts and ſcribes, and be killed, "and after three days riſe again[2];" all theſe things were ſo deſtructive of their principle, that *Peter* began to *rebuke him*, as if he had heard blaſphemy. *Chriſt* took an opportunity of inculcating this doctrine afreſh, when they were

[1] John xvi. 12. [2] Mark viii. 31.

in

in a ſtate of conviction at ſeeing him perform a miracle; endeavouring, as it were, to ſurprize them into a confeſſion of its truth: but the time was not yet.—" While they won-
" dered every one at all things which Jeſus did, he ſaid
" unto his diſciples, let theſe ſayings ſink down into your
" ears: for the Son of man ſhall be delivered into the
" hands of men. But they underſtood not this ſaying; it
" was hid from them, that they perceived it not [1]." The terms were clear and intelligible enough; and the ideas conveyed by them were all common and familiar: but if that ſaying were admitted, they muſt part with their beloved principle: therefore it follows, that *they were afraid to aſk him of that ſaying*; leſt he ſhould carry on the ſubject, and leave them no way to eſcape. They had already heard more than they would believe, and therefore, as to any thing farther, thought it beſt to remain in the dark.

In ſhort, where there is a taſte and reliſh for " the things
" that be of men," more than for " the things that be of
" God," and ſome principle is imbibed wherein the paſſions are ſtrongly engaged, men are to be perſuaded of any thing, and of nothing: ready to take up with every deſpicable pretence to prop and ſupport their favourite opinion; and deaf to the plaineſt words and moſt infallible proofs, if they tend to eſtabliſh the other ſide of the queſtion. For example; that a *Meſſiah* was to deliver their nation, was allowed by all the *Jews*; and they were well agreed as to the time of his coming, and the place where he ſhould be born. It was to be ſhewn, that *Jeſus of Nazareth* was the perſon: and for a proof of it, they were bid to compare the Scripture with the things he did and taught. " But though he
" had done ſo many miracles before them, yet they believed
" not on him [2];" and as if he had left the proof of his miſſion obſcure and defective, they came very formally to him to *aſk a ſign of him*, after they had ſeen ſo many ſigns; and called out to the very laſt for better evidence, bidding him " come down from the croſs," that they might " ſee and

[1] Luke ix. 43, 44. [2] John xii. 37.

" believe [1]." One would take theſe *Jews* to have been *Sceptics*, who would perſevere in their doubtings againſt every propoſition that could be offered. But if we judge from their behavio r upon ſome other occaſions, there never was a more credulous generation upon the face of the earth. They could receive full ſatisfaction from the moſt childiſh and inconſiſtent tales that ever were invented. The ſelf-contradiction of *Satan caſting out Satan*; or the report of a few Heathen ſoldiers, who witneſſed what was done " while " they were aſleep," could paſs for good goſpel; while the moſt evident miracles, and the cleareſt prophecies, were all nothing to the purpoſe, where they did not like the concluſion. And for the ſame reaſon, the whole Goſpel itſelf, while it is the ſavour of life to ſome, is a ſavour of death to others! as different as life and death! yet nevertheleſs one and the ſame Goſpel. It is like the pillar that ſtood between the camp of *Iſrael*, and the hoſt of *Egypt*; which was a *cloud* to the one, and *light* to the other [2]. But who will deny that the light was clear to the *Iſraelites*, becauſe the *Egyptians* ſaw nothing but a cloud of darkneſs?

Behold then the true ſource of all our religious differences: they proceed from the blindneſs and corruption of the human heart, increaſed and cheriſhed by ſome falſe principle that ſuits with its appetites: and all the prudence and learning the world can boaſt, will exempt no child of *Adam* from this miſerable weakneſs: nothing but the grace of God can poſſibly remove it. Where that is ſuffered to enter, and the heart, inſtead of perſiſting in its own will, is ſurrendered to the will of God, the whole Goſpel is ſufficiently clear, becauſe no text of it is any longer offenſive.

Of this happy change we have the beſt example in the Apoſtles of our bleſſed *Saviour*; who, when they firſt entered the ſchool of Chriſtianity, had a veil upon their hearts like the reſt of their countrymen, and were ſtrongly poſſeſſed by a ſpirit of the world, promiſing itſelf the full enjoyment of temporal honours and preferments. But the ſufferings and

[1] Mark xv. 32. [2] Exod. xiv. 20.

death

death of their Maſter having ſhewed the vanity of ſuch expectations, and ſerved in a great meaſure to beat down this earthly principle, they were ready for conviction; and then "their underſtanding was opened, that they might under-"ſtand the Scriptures[1]." The evidence that before was dark and inconcluſive, became on a ſudden clear and irreſiſtible; and they who had lately fled from diſgrace and death as from the greateſt of evils, could now *rejoice that they were found worthy to ſuffer*. Their opinion was altered, becauſe their affections were cleanſed from this world: that mire and *clay* was waſhed off from their eyes in the true waters of *Siloam*, and now they could *ſee all things clearly*.

What has been here ſaid upon the conduct of our *Saviour*'s diſciples, and the unbelieving *Jews*, may be applied to all thoſe who diſpute any article of the *Chriſtian Faith*; and particularly the doctrine of the *ever-bleſſed Trinity*, as revealed to us in the Holy Scriptures. For we ſhall certainly find that ſome falſe principle is aſſumed, which flatters the pride of human nature. It abhors reſtraint and ſubjection; and is ever aſpiring, right or wrong, to be diſtinguiſhed from the common herd, and to "exalt itſelf againſt the know-"ledge of God[2]." What this principle is, we ſhall very ſoon diſcover: it is publicly owned and gloried in by every conſiderable writer that of late years has meddled with this ſubject. I ſhall inſtance in the learned Dr. *Clarke*; becauſe he is deſervedly placed at the head of the *Arian* diſputants in this kingdom.

He affirms in his firſt *Propoſition*, that the ONE GOD, ſpoken of in *Matth.* xix. 17. and elſewhere, is only one PERSON; and then adds, "This is the *firſt principle of* "*Natural Religion*[*]."

So then here are two different religions; by one of which it is proved, that the *one God* is the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghoſt: that he is therefore *three* perſons. But it is the *firſt principle* of the other religion, that he is but *one* perſon: though how that can be reconciled with the prac-

[1] Luke xxiv. 45. [2] 2 Cor. x. 5. [*] See Script. Doctr. p. ii. §. 1.

tice of the whole Heathen world, who were ſo far from diſcovering this *one perſon*, that they held "Gods many, and "Lords many[1]," is not very eaſy to determine. And whence comes this religion? it is confeſſed to be drawn from *nature!* it is the Goſpel of the *natural man*, unſanctified by divine grace, and uninſtructed by any light from above; and owes its birth to that fountain of darkneſs and ſelf-conceit, from whence has ſprung all the confuſion and imagination that ever was introduced into the religion of God. And what wonder, if *nature* ſhould operate as ſtrongly in an *Arian* or a *Socinian* againſt the myſtery of the *Trinity*, as it did in the *Jews* againſt the *Law* and the *Prophets*, and in the unconverted diſciples againſt the doctrine of the *Croſs?* If it be laid down as a *firſt principle*, that God is but *one Perſon*, then it will be utterly impoſſible, ſo long as this principle keeps poſſeſſion, that any perſon, of common ſenſe enough to know the meaning of words, ſhould quietly receive and embrace a revelation in thoſe parts of it, where it teaches us that God is *three Perſons:* theſe two principles being ſo diametrically oppoſite, that while he holds to the one, a voice from the dead will not perſuade him of the other. Therefore, I ſay again, we ought not to wonder if that man ſhould remain for ever *invincible*, who BRINGS to the Scripture that knowledge of God, which he is bound, as a Chriſtian, to RECEIVE from it.

What then will be the conſequence in this caſe? The practice of the *Deiſt*, who carries on this argument to its proper iſſue, is to *deny* the Scripture-revelation, becauſe his *natural religion* is contrary to it; and they cannot both be true. But the partial unbeliever, who allows the Scripture to be ſupported by ſuch external evidence as he cannot anſwer, while his reaſon objects to the matter contained in it, muſt follow the example of the *Jews*, and *reconcile* the Scripture where he cannot *believe* it. Thus they treated the law of *Moſes*. "We know," ſaid they, "that God ſpake unto "Moſes[2];" therefore they readily granted his law to have

[1] 1 Cor. viii. 5. [2] John ix. 29.

a divine

a divine authority: but as it would not ſerve their turn in its own proper words, they put a falſe gloſs of tradition upon the face of it, to hide its true complexion; and then complained that the Scripture was not clear enough: and if you uſed it as a teſtimony to *Jeſus Chriſt*, they would ſtone you for a *blaſphemer*.

What ſhall we ſay then? that the *Jews* were of a *different opinion* from the *Chriſtians?* and that this was *their way* of *underſtanding* the Scripture? No; God forbid. For if we will believe the Scripture itſelf, it was their way of *denying* it. "Had ye believed Moſes," ſays our Lord, "ye "would have believed me:" and he gives us upon this occaſion the true grounds and reaſons of their unbelief; becauſe they "received honour one of another, and had not "the love of God in them [1]." Every hypotheſis of human growth, which was pretty ſure to agree with their complexion, and reflected ſome honour upon themſelves by exalting the nature of man, that can make a *religion for itſelf*, and comes in its *own name*; *that* they would gladly *receive*. But if any thing was offered to them in the name of God, to be received for the love of him, and the ſpiritual comfort of a pure conſcience, and the hope of a better world: it was rejected, as an encroachment upon their *natural rights*, and an invective againſt the innocent pleaſures of a carnal *Jeruſalem*. And ſo it is with us at this time: for if an author does but hang out the ſign of *Nature and reaſon* in his title-page, there are readers in plenty, who will buy up and ſwallow his dregs by wholeſale: but if God, of his infinite mercy and condeſcenſion, ſhews to them the *way of ſalvation*, his words are to be abſtracted from the evidence upon which he requires us to believe them, then put into this alembic of *reaſon*, and demonſtrated to be no *poiſon*, before they can be brought to taſte them. And if they ſhould happen to be a little diſagreeable to fleſh and blood, and the operation ſhould miſcarry, the fault is charged upon God,

[1] See John v. 39.—*ad fin.*

and

and not upon themſelves, who ought to have gone another way to work; as they will certainly find.

We conclude, therefore, becauſe *Chriſt* has affirmed it, that every degree of doubt and diſputation againſt the words of God, is juſt ſo much *unbelief*; proceeding not from the head or underſtanding, but from the heart [1] and affections. And the world is filled with the vain jangling of uncertainty, for this ſhort reaſon——"all men have not faith [2]."

[1] Heb. iii. 12. [2] 2 Theſſ. iii. 2.

ADVER-

ADVERTISEMENT,

IN all the *Texts* which are compared together in the following work, thoſe particular words, whereon the ſtreſs of the compariſon lies, are printed in *Capitals*; that the argument obtained from them may ſhew itſelf to the reader upon the firſt inſpection. And I hope, after what has been obſerved to him in the foregoing diſcourſe, that this is the only admonition he will ſtand in need of. The arguments I have drawn from the Scripture are, to the beſt of my knowledge, moſt of them new; and, if I may judge from my own mind, the manner in which they are laid down, is more likely to convince, than any I have yet ſeen. Had I thought otherwiſe, I could eaſily have forborn to trouble myſelf or the world with the tranſcribing and printing them. The end I have propoſed is not to obtain any reputation (to which this is not the way) but to do ſome little good, of which there is much need. I do therefore ſincerely recommend the following work, and every reader of it, to the grace and bleſſing of Almighty God, well knowing, that "unleſs the Lord keep the city, the watchman waketh but "in vain."

CHAP. I.

THE DIVINITY OF CHRIST.

I.

Iſa. viii. 13, 14. Sanctify the LORD OF HOSTS HIMSELF, and let HIM be your fear, and let HIM be your dread: and HE ſhall be for a Sanctuary; but for a STONE OF STUMBLING and ROCK OF OFFENCE to both houſes of *Iſrael.*

1 *Pet.* ii. 7, 8. The ſtone which the builders diſallowed, the ſame is made the head of the corner, and a STONE OF STUMBLING, and ROCK OF OFFENCE.

Inſtead of reaſoning upon theſe words of the Prophet *Iſaiah*, according to any private interpretation, I add another paſſage of Scripture, wherein they are expreſsly applied to the perſon of *Chriſt*; and then ſhew what muſt be the reſult of *both*. If the Scripture, thus compared with itſelf, be drawn up into an argument, the concluſion may indeed be *denied*, and ſo may the whole Bible, but it cannot be *anſwered*. For example:

The *Stone of Stumbling* and *Rock of Offence*, as the *former* text affirms, is the *Lord of Hoſts himſelf*; a name which the

Arians allow to no other but the one, only true, and ſupreme God [1].

But this *Stone of Stumbling*, and *Rock of Offence*, as it appears from the *latter* text, is no other than *Chriſt*, the ſame ſtone which the *builders refuſed*; Therefore,

Chriſt is the LORD OF HOSTS HIMSELF: and the *Arian* is confuted upon his own principles.

II.

Iſa. vi. 5. Mine Eyes have SEEN the King, the LORD OF HOSTS.

John xii. 41. Theſe things ſaid *Eſaias*, when he SAW HIS (CHRIST'S) GLORY, and ſpake of HIM.

Jeſus is the perſon here ſpoke of by St. *John*; whoſe *Glory*, *Eſaias* is declared to have *ſeen* upon that occaſion, where the prophet affirms of himſelf, that his Eyes had *ſeen* the *Lord of Hoſts;* Therefore,

Jeſus is the LORD OF HOSTS.

III.

Iſai. xliv. 6. Thus ſaith the *Lord*, the King of *Iſrael* and his Redeemer, the LORD OF HOSTS, I am THE FIRST, and I am THE LAST, and BESIDES ME there is NO GOD.

Rev. xxii. 13. I (*Jeſus*) am Alpha and Omega, the Beginning and the End, THE FIRST and THE LAST.

Theſe Titles of *the firſt* and *the laſt* are confined to him alone, *beſides whom there is no God*; But *Jeſus* hath aſſumed theſe Titles to *himſelf:* Therefore, *Jeſus* is that *God, beſides whom there is no other.* Or Thus—There is no *God* beſides him who is *the firſt* and *the laſt:* but, *Jeſus* is *the firſt* and *the laſt*; therefore *beſides Jeſus* there is *no* other *God.*

[1] See an *Eſſay on Spirit*, p. 65. *Clarke's* Doctr. of the Trin. C. 10. §. 3. 402.

IV.

IV.

Iſai. xliii. 11. I even I am the LORD, and BESIDES ME there is NO SAVIOUR[1].

2 *Pet.* iii. 18. OUR LORD and SAVIOUR JESUS CHRIST.

Jeſus Chriſt, then, is *our Saviour*; or, as he is called, *John* iv. 42. *The Saviour of the World.* But unleſs he were *God*, even the *Lord*, *Jehovah*, as well as man, he could not be a Saviour; becauſe the *Lord* has declared, there is no Saviour beſide *himſelf.* It is therefore rightly obſerved by the Apoſtle, *Phil.* ii. 9. that *God*, in dignifying the man *Chriſt* with the *name of* JESUS, hath given him a name *above every name*, even that of *a Saviour*, which is his *own name*, and ſuch as can belong to no other.

V.

Rev. xxii. 6. The LORD GOD of the *Holy Prophets* SENT HIS ANGEL to *ſhew* unto *his Servants* the *things* which muſt ſhortly be done.

Ibid. v. 16. I JESUS have SENT MINE ANGEL to teſtify unto you *theſe things* in the *Churches.*

The *Angel* that appeared to St. *John* was the *Angel* of the *Lord God*, and the Lord God *ſent* him: but he was the *Angel* of *Jeſus*, and Jeſus *ſent* him: therefore, *Jeſus* is the *Lord God of the Holy Prophets.*

VI.

Luke i. 76. And thou Child ſhalt be called the Prophet of THE HIGHEST, for thou ſhalt GO BEFORE the FACE of the LORD TO PREPARE HIS WAYS.

[1] The argument drawn from this text will be equally convincing, which ever way it be taken—Jeſus Chriſt is a *Saviour*, therefore he is *Jehovah*, *the Lord*—Jeſus Chriſt is *Jehovah*, therefore he is *the Saviour.* The beſt obſervations I have ever met with upon the name *Jehovah*, and it's application to the ſecond Perſon of the Trinity, are to be found in a *Vindication of the Doctrine of the Trinity from the Exceptions of a late pamphlet entitled an Eſſay on Spirit* —by the learned Dr. *T. Randolph*, Preſident of C. C. C. in *Oxford*; which I would deſire the Reader to conſult, from p. 61 to 71 of Pt. I.

Matth.

Matth. xi. 10. Behold, I ſend my meſſenger BEFORE THY FACE, TO PREPARE THY WAY before thee.

John the *Baptiſt* goes before the *face of the Lord*, that is, of the *Higheſt*, whoſe *prophet* he is, to prepare *his* way. But he was ſent as a Meſſenger before *the face of Chriſt*, to prepare *his* way; who, therefore, is the *Lord*, and *the Higheſt*.

VII.

The two following texts are but a repetition of the ſame argument: but as they ſpeak of *Chriſt* under a different name, they ought to have a place for themſelves.

Luke i. 16, 17. And many of the children of *Iſrael* ſhall he turn to the LORD THEIR GOD: and he ſhall *go before* HIM.

Matth. iii. 11. HE that cometh AFTER ME is mightier than I—&c.

Here again, the *Baptiſt* is ſaid to *go before* the *Lord God of the children of Iſrael*: but it is certain, he *went before* Jeſus Chriſt, the only perſon who is ſaid to *come after* him: therefore, *Jeſus Chriſt* is the *Lord God of the children of* Iſrael. And the ſame title is given to him in the prophet *Hoſea*,—*I will have mercy upon the houſe of* Judah, *and will* ſave *them by the* Lord their God: which can be no other than the voice of *God* the *Father*, promiſing *Salvation* by the perſon of *God* the *Son*.

VIII.

Matth. xi. 10. Behold I ſend MY *meſſenger before* THY *face*, to prepare THY way *before* THEE.

Mal. iii. 1. Behold I ſend MY meſſenger to prepare the way *before* ME.

As this prophecy is worded by St. *Matthew* (as alſo by St. *Mark*[1] and St. *Luke*[2]) there is a perſonal diſtinction

[1] Mark i. 2. [2] Luke vii. 27.

between

between Him who *ſends* his *Meſſenger*, and *Chriſt* before whom the *Meſſenger is ſent—I ſend* MY *Meſſenger—to prepare thy way* before THEE. But the *Prophet* himſelf has it thus—*I ſend* MY *meſſenger, to prepare the way* before ME. Yet the *Evangeliſt* and the *Prophet* are both equally correct and true. For though *Chriſt* be a *different perſon*, yet is he *one* and the *ſame God* with *the Father*. And hence it is, that with the *Evangeliſt*, the *perſons* are not *confounded*; with the *Prophet* the *Godhead* is not *divided*. This argument may ſerve to juſtify an excellent obſervation of our Church in the *Homily* upon the Reſurrection—"How dare we be ſo "bold to renounce the preſence of the *Father, Son, and* "*Holy Ghoſt?* for where *one* is, there is *God* all *whole* in "Majeſty, together with all his power, wiſdom, and good-"neſs."

IX.

Pſ. lxxviii. 56. They TEMPTED and provoked the MOST HIGH GOD.

1 *Cor.* x. 9. Neither let us TEMPT CHRIST as ſome of *them* alſo *tempted*.

Theſe texts do both relate to the ſame rebellious acts of the *Iſraelites* in the *wilderneſs*. In the *former* of them, the perſon they *tempted* is called the *moſt High God:* in the *latter* he is called *Chriſt:* therefore, *Chriſt* is the *moſt High God.*

X.

John iii. 29. He that hath the Bride, is THE BRIDEGROOM *—(meaning *Chriſt.*)

But,

* Another title of Eminence, that ſhews *Chriſt* to be upon an equality with *God the Father*, is to be collected from the following Scriptures.

Pſal. xxiii. 1. The LORD (Heb. *Jehovah*) is my SHEPHERD.

John x. 16. There ſhall be one fold, and ONE SHEPHERD.

If *Chriſt* be not the *Lord*, in *Unity* with the *Father*, there muſt of courſe be *two diſtinct beings*, to whom the Scripture has appropriated this Character of a *Shepherd*; and that would make *two Shepherds*. But *Chriſt* has affirmed there is but *one Shepherd*, that is *himſelf*, THE SHEPHERD *of the Sheep*, v. 2. whom St. *Peter* calls the *chief Shepherd*, 1 *Pet.* v. 4. So again——

But, according to the Prophet,

Iſai. liv. 5. Thy Maker is thine HUSBAND, the LORD OF HOSTS is his Name.—

And the *Church*, which is the *Bride* of *Chriſt*, can no more have two diſtinct *huſbands*, than *Chriſt* can have two diſtinct *Churches*. As the Church is the *Bride*, the *Body*, the *Building* of God; and as there is *one* Bride, *one* body, *one* building; ſo *is* there on the other hand, *one* God, who is the *huſband* or *Bridegroom*; *one* Chriſt, who is the *Head*; *one* God with the Lamb, who is the *Light* of it. Compare alſo *Jer.* iii. 1. and 31, 32. *Ezek.* xvi. *Hoſ.* ii. *Matth.* ix. 15.—xxv. 1. 2 *Cor.* ii. 2. *Eph.* v. 23. *Rev.* xix. 7. and xxi. 2, 9.

XI.

Here follow ſome ſingle Texts, to which I add no parallels; there being no danger of miſtaking their *application*.

John xx. 28. And *Thomas* anſwered and ſaid, MY LORD, and MY GOD.

XII.

Rom. ix. 5. Of whom as concerning the Fleſh CHRIST came, who is over all, GOD BLESSED for EVER. *Amen.*

XIII.

2 *Pet.* i. 1.—Through the Righteouſneſs of OUR GOD *and Saviour* JESUS CHRIST.

The *Greek is*—τȣ Θεȣ ημων καὶ Σωτηρος Ιησȣ Χριςȣ—the very ſame, as to the order and Grammar of the words, with the laſt verſe of this Epiſtle—τȣ Κυριȣ ημων καὶ Σωτηρος Ιησȣ Χριςȣ—which is thus rendered in our Engliſh verſion—*of*

Pſal. c. 3. Know ye that the LORD he Is GOD—we are His people, and the SHEEP of His paſture.

John x. 3. HE (that is *Chriſt* himſelf) calleth His own SHEEP.

And again—*John* xxi. 16. *Feed* MY *Sheep*—ſaid *Chriſt* to St. *Peter*: which in the Language of St. *Peter* himſelf, 1 *Pet.* v. 2. is—Feed the Flock of GOD.

our

our Lord and Saviour Jeſus Chriſt. And ſo, without doubt, it ſhould be in the other paſſage: there being no poſſible reaſon why, τȣ Θεȣ ημων, ſhould not ſignify, *our God*, as well as τȣ Κυριȣ ημων, *our Lord*. It is not my deſign to caſt any reflection upon the wiſdom of our excellent and orthodox *Tranſlators* (whoſe verſion, taken altogether, is without exception the beſt extant in the world) or to advance this as any diſcovery of my own: for the *Tranſlators* themſelves have preſerved the true rendering in the *Margin*; declaring it, by their cuſtomary note, to be the *literal* ſenſe of the *Greek*.

There is another expreſſion, *Tit.* ii. 13. that ought to be claſſed with the foregoing. *Looking for that bleſſed hope, and the glorious appearing,* τȣ μεγαλȣ Θεȣ κ᾽ Σωτηρος ημων Ιησȣ Χρȣ, *of our* Great God *and Saviour, Jeſus Chriſt.* Of which a great man, deep in the *Arian* Scheme, gives this deſponding Account.—" Many underſtand this whole Sen-
" tence to belong to one and the ſame Perſon, *viz.* Chriſt:
" as if the words ſhould have been rendered, *The appearing of*
" *our great God and Saviour Jeſus Chriſt.* Which Con-
" ſtruction, the words will indeed bear; as do alſo thoſe in
" 2 *Pet.* i. 1. But it is much more *reaſonable*, and more
" agreeable to the *whole Tenor of Scripture*, to underſtand
" the former part of the words, to relate to *the Father* [1]."
As for the *whole Tenor of Scripture*, it is a weighty phraſe, but very eaſily made uſe of in any cauſe good or bad: ſo I ſhall leave the reader to judge of *that*, after it has been exhibited to him in the following pages. And as for the *reaſonableneſs* of the thing itſelf, let any ſerious perſon conſider, whether the Doctrine of the Scripture is not more *rational* under the orthodox application of theſe words, than under that of this Author. For to allow, as he does, that *Chriſt* is *God*, but not the *Great God*, is to make *two Gods*, a *greater* and a *leſſer*; which is no very *rational* principle. And I make not the leaſt doubt but this Author, had he been dreſſing up a Syſtem of *natural religion*, would have

1 *Clarke's* Doctr. of the Trin. C. 2: §. 1. 541.

proteſted againſt a notion ſo abſurd and impious. But when the *Scripture* was to be *dealt* with, he choſe it as the leſſer of two evils, the greater of which, was the doctrine he had *ſubſcribed* to.

XIV.

2 *Cor.* v. 19. GOD was IN CHRIST, reconciling the world to HIMSELF.

It is allowed on all hands, that the *world* was *reconciled* by Chriſt Jeſus to the *one*, *only*, *great*, and *ſupreme God*. But, this very *ſame God* (for the word is but *once* uſed in the whole ſentence) was *in* Chriſt; manifeſt *in* the fleſh, and *reconciling the world to* himſelf. And were there no other paſſage of Scripture to be found, this alone is ſufficient to overthrow the whole doctrine of *Arianiſm*; which, as far as the Scripture is concerned, depends upon this one aſſertion—that "the word GOD, in Scripture, NEVER ſignifies a com-"plex notion of *more perſons than one*; but ALWAYS "means *one perſon only*, *viz.* either the perſon of the *Father* "ſingly, or the perſon of the *Son* ſingly [1]." Which is abſolutely falſe: for here it ſignifies *both*. The text conſiders *God* as agent and patient at the ſame time, and upon the ſame occaſion; as the *reconciler* of the world, in the *perſon* of the *Son*; and the object to whom the *reconciliation was made*, in the *perſon* of the *Father*; yet there is but one word (*God*) to expreſs them *both*. So that the word *God*, though of the *ſingular* number, is of a *plural* comprehenſion. And thus I find it to have been taken by ſome of the moſt eminent writers before the council of *Nice*, "*Plaſ-*"*matus in initio homo per manus* DEI, *id eſt*, FILII & "SPIRITUS," ſays *Irenæus* [2]; putting the ſingular name of *God*, for the *two perſons* of the *Son* and *Spirit*. And the ſame word, in the language of *Origen*, (if we are allowed to take the verſion of *Ruffinus* as genuine) includes the whole *three* perſons—*Igitur de* DEO, *id eſt*, *de* PATRE & FILIO & SPIRITU *ſancto* [3]. And our excellent church has uſed

[1] *Clarke's* S. D. P. II. §. 33. [2] Lib. V. §. 23. [3] *De principiis.* Lib. IV. C. 2.

the

the word *God* in the ſame comprehenſive ſenſe; as in the *Bleſſing* after the communion ſervice—GOD ALMIGHTY, *the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghoſt.*

XV.

John xiv. 11. I am in the Father, and the Father IN ME.

Compare this with the foregoing article.

XVI.

1 *Cor.* v. 20. We are ambaſſadors for CHRIST, as though GOD did BESEECH you by us. We PRAY you IN CHRIST'S STEAD be ye reconciled to GOD.

The uſefulneſs of this text to our preſent ſubject, lies in theſe words—"In *Chriſt*'s ſtead we *pray*, as though *God* did "*beſeech*"—where the interchanging of the names *God* and *Chriſt*, ſhews the *ſame perſon* to be intitled to *both*.

XVII.

1 *John* v. 20. We are in him that is true, even in his Son JESUS CHRIST: THIS IS the TRUE GOD and eternal life.

XVIII.

Col. ii. 8, 9. Beware leſt any man ſpoil you through Philoſophy and vain deceit, after the tradition of men, after the rudiments of the world, and not after CHRIST: for IN HIM DWELLETH ALL THE FULNESS of the GODHEAD BODILY.

The *Apoſtle* foreſaw, that a thing calling itſelf *Philoſophy* would ſet all its engines at work to deſtroy the notion of *Chriſt*'s true and abſolute Divinity—"*For in him* (ſays he) "*dwelleth all the fulneſs of the Godhead bodily. Philoſophy* "will diſpute this: and undertake to *demonſtrate* the con- "trary. But if you liſten to ſuch *vain deceit*, it will over- "throw your faith, and *ſpoil* you for a diſciple of *Jeſus* "*Chriſt*; therefore—*Beware.*"

XIX.

John i. 1. The WORD was GOD.

XX.

Iſai. ix. 6. For unto us a Child is born, unto us a Son is given, and the Government ſhall be upon his Shoulder: and his name ſhall be called Wonderful, Counſellor, the MIGHTY GOD, the EVERLASTING FATHER.

XXI.

Jer. xxiii. 6. This is the Name whereby he ſhall be called, the *Lord* (JEHOVAH) our Righteouſneſs.

XXII.

Iſai. ii. 17, 18. The LORD ALONE ſhall be EXALTED in that *day:* and the IDOLS he ſhall utterly aboliſh.

"*Idolatry* is the reverſe, and direct oppoſite to *Chriſtianity* "(or, the *day* of *Chriſt.*) To deſtroy this, was the great "end of *Chriſt*'s coming into the world.—But except he "were *God*, the *very* and *eternal God*, of *one Subſtance* with "the *Father*, his Religion would be ſo far from *deſtroying* "*Idolatry*, that it would only be a more refined and dangerous "ſpecies of it. The prophet therefore, concludes all, that "ſo he might acquit the worſhip of *Chriſt* from all charge "of *Idolatry*, with this poſitive aſſertion; that it would "prove the moſt effectual means of putting an end to all "falſe and Idolatrous Worſhip: *The Idols he ſhall utterly* "*aboliſh.* The like concluſion we meet with in the Apoſtle "St. *John*; who having affirmed that *Jeſus Chriſt* is *the* "*true God and eternal life*, immediately ſubjoins and cloſes "all with this advice,—*Little Children, keep yourſelves from* "IDOLS."

This Remark is taken from the firſt volume of *an Eſſay upon the proper Leſſons*; written, as I am told, by a gentleman of the Laity. There needs no apology for ſetting it down;

down; it being of good uſe in the ſubject I am upon. And it alſo gives me an occaſion of returning thanks to the pious and learned Author of that excellent work, not for myſelf only, but for many ſincere friends to the religion of *Chriſt* and the church of *England*, among whom his labours are not without their fruit; and I am confident they will not be without their reward: but the Author muſt be content to wait for it, till *Wiſdom ſhall be juſtified of all her Children.*

XXIII.

Rev. i. 8. I am *Alpha* and *Omega*, the beginning and the ending, ſaith the LORD, which is, and which was, and which is to come, the ALMIGHTY.

If the Reader will be pleaſed to examine the 13th and 17th verſes of this Chapter, it will appear that this 8th verſe was undoubtedly ſpoken from the mouth of *Chriſt:* who therefore has a juſt title to every name and attribute expreſſed in it; and among the reſt, to that of *the Almighty.*

Origen, who certainly was no *Arian*, though often repreſented as ſuch, by ſome who would be pleaſed to have the vote of ſo celebrated a genius, has the following obſervation. —" Now that you may know the *Omnipotence* of the *Father* " and the *Son* to be *one* and the *ſame* as HE is ONE and the " SAME GOD and LORD with the FATHER, hear " what St. *John* had ſaid in the *Revelation*—Theſe things, " *ſaith the Lord, which is, and which was, and which is to* " *come, the Almighty.*" For who is the *Almighty* that *is to come*, but *Chriſt* [1]?

XXIV.

The Texts that follow, with this mark (†), prefixed to them, are ſuch as have been abuſed by the *Arians* to ſupport their Hereſy: and to the beſt of my knowledge, there are ſome of every ſort. But when the Scripture is brought to

[1] Ut autem *unam & eandem omnipotentiam Patris & Filii* eſſe cognoſcas ſicut *unus* atque *idem* eſt cum *Patre Deus & Dominus*, audi hoc modo *Joan*, in *Apocalypſi* dicentem: *Hæc dicit Dominus Deus qui eſt, & qui erit, & qui venturus eſt omnipotens.* Qui enim venturus eſt *omnipotens*, quis eſt alius niſi *Chriſtus?*— *De principiis* Lib. i. C. 2.

declare its *own* ſenſe of them, they will either appear to be nothing to the purpoſe, or confirm and *preach* the *faith* they have been ſuppoſed to *deſtroy*.

† *Matth.* xix. 17. Why calleſt thou ME GOOD? there is none good but ONE, that is, GOD.

The objection is founded upon the *Greek*, which runs thus —Ουδεις εστιν αγαθος, ει μη εις, ο Θεος. *There is none good but* εις, one; and *that* (one) *is*, ο Θεος, *God*. Whence it is argued, that the adjective εις being in the *maſculine* Gender, cannot be interpreted to ſignify one *Being* or *Nature* (for then it ſhould have been EN, in the *Neuter*) but *one Perſon:* ſo that by confining the attribute of *goodneſs* to the ſingle perſon of *the Father*, it muſt of courſe exclude the perſons of the *Son* and *Holy Ghoſt* from the *Unity* of the *Godhead*.

To ſay the truth, I think this is the moſt plauſible objection I have ever met with; and I have ſincerely endeavoured to do it juſtice. If it is capable of being ſet in a ſtronger light, any man is welcome to add what he pleaſes to it. For ſuppoſing the word εις to ſignify *one perſon* (and in that lies the whole force of the argument) then if *one perſon* only is *good*, and that perſon is *God*; it muſt alſo follow, that there is but one perſon who is *God:* the name of *God* being as much confined hereby to a *ſingle perſon*, as the attribute of *goodneſs*. But this is utterly falſe; the names of *God*, *Lord*, *Lord of Hoſts*, *the Almighty*, *moſt High*, *Eternal*, *God of Iſrael*, &c. being alſo aſcribed to the *ſecond* and *third Perſons* of the bleſſed *Trinity*. Take it this way, therefore, and the objection by proving too much, confutes itſelf, and proves nothing.

The truth is, this criticiſm, upon the ſtrength of which ſome have dared to undeify their Saviour, has no foundation in the Original. The word εις is ſo far from requiring the ſubſtantive *perſon* to be underſtood with it, that it is put in the *maſculine* gender to agree with its ſubſtantive Θεος, and is beſt conſtrued by an adverb. If you follow the Greek by a literal tranſlation, it will be thus—*There is none Good*—ει μη

εις

εις ο Θεος—*but the one God*; that is, in common Engliſh—*but God only*. And it happens, that the ſame *Greek*, word for word, occurs in *Mark* ii. 7.—*Who can forgive ſins*—ει μη εις ο Θεος—*but God only*; ſo it is rendered by our tranſlators: and we have a plain matter of fact, that εις in this place cannot poſſibly admit the ſenſe of *one perſon*, becauſe *Chriſt*, who is *another perſon*, took upon him to *forgive ſins*. In the parallel place of St. *Luke*'s Goſpel [1], the expreſſion is varied, ſo as to make it ſtill clearer—ει μη μονος ο Θεος—not εις, but μονος, another adjective of the *maſculine* gender: which, though it agree with its ſubſtantive Θεος, is rightly conſtrued as an *adverb*—either the *alone God*, or *God only*. And the Greek itſelf uſes one for the other indifferently—as, επ' αρτῳ μονῳ, *by bread only* [2]—εν λογῳ μονον, *in word only* [3]. The utmoſt that can be gathered, therefore, from theſe words, is no more than this; that there is *one God* (in which we are all agreed) and that there is *none good* beſide him; which no body will diſpute. Whether in this *God*, there be *one perſon*, or *three*, remains yet to be conſidered: and the Scripture is ſo expreſs in other places, as to ſettle it beyond all diſpute.

If it ſhould here be aſked, for what reaſon *Chriſt* put this queſtion—"Why calleſt thou me *good?*" I anſwer; for the ſame reaſon that he aſked the *Phariſees*, why *David* in Spirit *called him LORD* [4]; and that was to try if they were able to account for it. This *ruler*, by addreſſing our Saviour under the name of *good Maſter*, when the inſpired Pſalmiſt had affirmed long before, that *there is none that doeth* GOOD, no NOT ONE [5]; did in effect allow him to be *God*; no mere man, ſince the fall of *Adam*, having any claim to that Character. And when he was called upon to explain his meaning, for that *God* only was *good*; he ſhould have replied in the words of St. *Thomas*—"My Lord, and my "GOD:" which would have been a nobler inſtance of Faith, and have cleared up the whole difficulty. If the caſe be conſidered, this man was a very proper ſubject for ſuch a trial. Fully convinced of his own ſufficiency, he comes

[1] Luke v. 21. [2] Matt. iv. 4. [3] 1 Theſſ. i. 5. [4] Matt. xxii. 43. [5] Pſalm xiv. 3.

to

to Chriſt in the preſence of his diſciples, to know what *good thing* he might do to merit everlaſting life. Whence our Saviour takes occaſion to correct his miſtake as to the nature of *goodneſs*; and having tried this *good* and *perfect* man in a tender point, ſent him away grievouſly diſſatisfied.

XXV.

† 1 *Cor.* xv. 24. Then cometh the END, when HE ſhall deliver up the KINGDOM to GOD, even the FATHER.

Luke l. 53. HE (*Jeſus*) ſhall reign over the houſe of *Jacob* for ever; and of HIS KINGDOM there ſhall be NO END.

This of St. *Luke*, being a contradiction in terms to that of the *Apoſtle*, ſhews the former to be ſpoken *only* of *Chriſt's humanity*; as the latter relates *only* to his *Divinity*. When both are laid together, it is evident to a demonſtration, that *Chriſt* is *perfect God*, as well as *perfect man*. As *man*, he *received* a *kingdom*, which again, as *man*, he ſhall *deliver up*, when his mediatorial office, for which he took the nature of man, ſhall be at an *end*. But there is a *kingdom* pertaining to him, which ſhall have *no end*. And this cannot be true, unleſs he is a *perſon* in that *God*, who after the *Humanity* has *delivered up the kingdom* ſhall be *all in all*. The diſtinction in this caſe between the *God* and *man* in the *joint perſon* of *Chriſt Jeſus*, is warranted by another part of the Chapter, wherein the *Apoſtle* has given us a key to his own meaning. *Since by* MAN (ſays he) *came death, by* MAN *came alſo the reſurrection of the dead. For as in* Adam *all die, even ſo in* Chriſt *ſhall all be made alive*. Here, it is evident, he is drawing a contraſt between the *man Adam* and the *man Chriſt*; ſo that unleſs it be done on purpoſe, no reader can eaſily miſtake the meaning of what follows—*Then cometh the End, when* HE (that is the *man Chriſt*, the ſecond *Adam*) *ſhall deliver up the kingdom*, &c. for ſo it muſt be, according to the tenor of the Apoſtle's diſcourſe.

The

The *New Teſtament* abounds with expreſſions of this nature; but they have no difficulty in them, if it only be remembered that Chriſt is *man* as well as *God*; which the *Arians* are willing upon all occaſions to forget. And it has been chiefly owing to an abuſe of theſe texts, that they have been able to put any tolerable gloſs upon their Hereſy. The *Old Teſtament* ſeldom ſpeaking of *Chriſt*, but as a Perſon of the Godhead *before* his Incarnation, does not afford them ſo many opportunities: and hence it is, that moſt of them confine their enquiries to the *New*, which is the hiſtory of him *after* his Incarnation, when he appeared, as the *firſt-born of many* brethren [1], *anointed above his* Fellows (*Mankind*) receiving authority and dominion from *God*, who by a power ſuperior to that of his human ſoul and body, put *all things in ſubjection* under the *feet* of it.

But ſome, for whoſe ſakes he thus humbled himſelf, and became obedient in the fleſh, inſtead of receiving it with humility and devotion, even caſt it in his teeth, and make it an argument *againſt* him: vainly imagining that they do honour to their ſupreme God, while they ſay with *Peter*—Lord, *be it far from thee: this ſhall not*, it cannot, *be unto* thee. And it is worth their while to conſider, whether they may not fall under the ſame rebuke, when it will be too late to retract and change their opinion.

A ſolemn advocate of theirs, whom I take to be a *diſſenter, tells us*—his *preſent concern is with the* New Teſtament *only* [2]. And another writer of ſome figure, who, you are to ſuppoſe, is addreſſing himſelf to a *young Clergyman*, puts it into his head, that he "*may reject* arguments *brought from the* "Old Teſtament *to prove the* Trinity, *as* trifling, *and* "*proving nothing but the* Ignorance *of thoſe that make uſe of* "*them* [3]." And I could wiſh *that* were all: for I had much rather be accounted a *fool* in *their* judgment, than find myſelf under a neceſſity of charging them with the horrible guilt, of *denying the* Lord *that hath bought them.*

[1] Rom. viii. 29. [2] A ſequel to the *Eſſay on Spirit*, p. 8.

[3] *Letter* to a *young Clergyman* upon the *Difficulties and Diſcouragements* which attend the *ſtudy* of the *Scriptures* in the way of *private judgment.*

XXVI.

† *Acts* x. 42.—That it is HE, which is ORDAINED of GOD to be the *judge* of quick and dead.

This paſſage will help us to detect, once for all, that common fallacy of our Adverſaries, in miſapplying ſuch words as relate only to the *human* nature of *Chriſt*, and erecting arguments thereupon to the degrading of his ſupreme Eſſence. *Chriſt* is *ordained* of *God*, it is true: and the nature that *receives* power, muſt be *inferior* to the nature that *confers* it. But is his *Godhead* therefore *ordained?* They tell you it is; and their ſcheme requires it: But the *Scriptures* declare the contrary—GOD (ſaith St. *Paul*) *hath appointed a day wherein* HE *will* JUDGE *the world in righteouſneſs by that* MAN εν ανδρι, (IN *that* MAN) *whom he hath* ORDAINED [1]. The ſupreme God that was *manifeſt in the fleſh*, and IN *Chriſt reconciling the world to* HIMSELF, ſhall remain in the ſame perſonal union with him, till he has *judged* the world, and is ready to *deliver up the kingdom.* And though our *Judge* ſhall even then retain the Character of a *Man*, yet as *God* who *ordained* him, ſhall be preſent with him in the ſame perſon, the act of the laſt judgment is equally aſcribed to both natures. In the text juſt above cited, it is ſaid—*He* (God) will *judge* the world; tho' it immediately follows, that a *man*, even the *man Chriſt*, is *ordained* to this office. And ſo we have it again in the Epiſtle to the *Romans—we ſhall all appear before the* judgment ſeat *of* Chriſt. *For it is written, as I live, ſaith the* Lord, *every knee ſhall bow to* ME, *and every tongue ſhall confeſs unto* GOD [2]. We are to give an account of ourſelves at the *judgment ſeat of* Chriſt. And how does the *Apoſtle* prove it? Why, becauſe it is written, that we ſhall give an account of ourſelves to the *Lord God*, who ſwears that *he liveth.* But unleſs *Chriſt*, who is a *man*, be alſo this *living God* and *Lord*, this proof is not to the purpoſe.

[1] Acts xvii. 31. [2] Iſai. xlv. 23.

XXVII.

XXVII.

† *Acts* x. 40. Him GOD raiſed up and SHEWED HIM openly to us who did eat and drink with him *after he roſe from the dead.*

John xxi. 1. After theſe things JESUS SHEWED HIMSELF again to his *diſciples* at the Sea of *Tiberias*; and on this wiſe SHEWED HE HIMSELF.

The former text takes ſomething from *Chriſt*, as *man*; in which capacity he was at the *diſpoſal of the Father*. But the latter reſtores it to him again as *God*; under which character he is at his *own diſpoſal*, and in unity with the Father. The ſame is to be ſaid of the two articles which follow.

XXVIII.

† *John* iii. 16. GOD ſo LOVED the world, that HE GAVE his only begotten Son.

Epheſ. v. 25. CHRIST alſo LOVED the Church, and GAVE HIMSELF for it.

XXIX.

† *Eph.* iv. 32. *Forgiving one another*, even as GOD, for CHRIST'S SAKE, hath FORGIVEN *you*.

Col. iii. 13. *Forgiving one another*—even as CHRIST FORGAVE *you*.

XXX.

† *John* vi. 38. I came down from heaven, NOT to do MY OWN WILL, but the WILL of HIM that SENT ME.

Matth. viii. 2. And behold there came a Leper and *worſhipped* him, ſaying, LORD, if THOU WILT thou canſt make me clean. And JESUS ſaid, (Θελω) I WILL, be thou clean.

XXXI.

XXXI.

† *Acts* xiv. 29, 30. And now, LORD—grant—that *ſigns* and *wonders* may be *done* by the NAME of THY HOLY CHILD JESUS.

It ſeems here, that *ſigns* and *wonders* were not to be wrought by *Jeſus Chriſt*, as the *author* of them; but by an higher power of the LORD, put into action by the *name*, Merits, or Interceſſion of the *Holy Child Jeſus*. Yet St. *Peter* makes this ſame *Jeſus*, though in *heaven*, the immediate author of the *ſigns* and *wonders* wrought by his diſciples upon earth.—"Eneas (ſays he) JESUS CHRIST "*maketh thee whole.*" *Acts* ix. 34.

XXXII.

† *Matth.* xx. 23. To SIT on my right hand and on my left, is NOT MINE TO GIVE, but (*it ſhall be given*) to them for whom it is prepared of MY FATHER.

Yet our bleſſed Saviour has promiſed elſewhere, to beſtow this reward in his *own right*—"*To him that overcometh will I* "GRANT *to* SIT *with me in* MY THRONE." *Rev.* iii. 21. This is ſufficient to reſcue the text from any heretical uſe that may have been made of it. But ſtill there remains ſome difficulty, which, with God's help, I ſhall endeavour to clear up. It will appear to any perſon, not ignorant of *Greek*, that the original in this place does reſerve to *Chriſt* that act of power and authority, of which the *Engliſh* verſion, by inſerting a few words, ſeems to have diveſted him. The *Greek* is this—ουκ εστιν εμον δουναι—*it is not mine to give*, αλλ' οις ητοιμασται, *but to them for whom it is prepared*—"niſi "quibus paratum eſt." For in the eleventh verſe of the foregoing Chapter, there is an expreſſion exactly parallel—αλλ' οις δεδοται—*ſave they to whom it is given*; or as *Beza* hath it—"ſed *ii* quibus datum." Now there can be no grammatical reaſon, why we ſhould not take—αλλ' οις ητοιμασται—in the ſame manner; and then the text will *affirm* what it now ſeems to *deny*. For to ſay, that *Chriſt* cannot give

give any particular reward, *ſave to them for whom it is prepared of his Father*, is the ſame as to ſay, that to *ſuch* he *can* and *will give it*; according to the common maxim—*Exceptio* probat *regulam in non-exceptis.*

The ſcope of the Text therefore, is to ſhew, that nothing can be granted even by Almighty power itſelf, where there is not a ſuitable merit or diſpoſition in the perſons who claim it. "God ſhall give this honourable place to thoſe, "for whom it is prepared by an invariable rule of juſtice; "whoſe victory of Faith being foreknown and accepted, a "ſeat is allotted them according to it." And the two paſſages being laid together, ſupply us with this principle. As if our *Saviour*, who is the *ſpeaker* in *both* places, had ſaid—"Tho' it be *not mine to give*; yet, to him that *over-*"*cometh*, will *I* (even *I myſelf*) *grant* to *ſit* with me in *my* "*Throne*; becauſe for *him* this ſeat is *prepared.*" It is not owing to a defect of power in the Trinity, or in any perſon of it, that the divine purpoſe cannot be changed; but becauſe it is impoſſible for the power of God to break in upon the order of his diſtributive juſtice. And it is upon this account only, that we read of *Chriſt*, *Mark* vi. 5. "*He* "COULD *there do* NO *mighty work.*" For the *power* of doing a miracle was always preſent with him; but the *place* being *improper* becauſe of their *unbelief*, made the thing impoſſible. In the ſame manner, that declaration of the *Lord* in *Gen.* xvii. 22. is to be accounted for,—*Haſte thee, eſcape thither, for* I CANNOT *do any thing till thou be come thither.* No man would hence conclude, that the hand of God is ſtraitened, or his power limited; but only that he does, and by his own nature *muſt*, act agreeable to the diſpoſition of things and perſons, known to himſelf.

XXXIII.

† 1 *Cor.* viii. 6. To US there is but ONE GOD, THE FATHER.

If we compare this with that expreſſion of St. *Thomas*,—*John* xx. 28.—MY LORD, *and* MY GOD, we have the following argument:

To

To US there is but one GOD, the FATHER.

But TO US JESUS CHRIST is GOD: therefore, The Goſpel has either preached *two Gods to us*, one *diſtinct* from the other: or that *one God the Father* is here the name of a *nature*, under which *Chriſt* himſelf, as *God*, is alſo comprehended. And the ſame may be proved of it in ſeveral other places.

XXXIV.

† *Matth.* xxiii. 9. Call no man your Father upon earth, for ONE is YOUR FATHER *which is in heaven.*

Ibid. v. 10. Neither be ye called maſters, for ONE is YOUR MASTER, even CHRIST. *John* iii. 13. *which is in heaven.*

Dr. *Clarke* has a particular Section [1], wherein he pretends to have ſet down *the Paſſages that aſcribe the higheſt Titles, Perfections, and Powers*, to the ſecond Perſon of the Trinity. Yet he has wholly omitted the latter of theſe verſes; though by a rule of his own making, it allows to *Chriſt* an higher title than any other in the whole Scripture. It is this ſame Author, who has laid ſo great a ſtreſs upon the word εἷς, *one*, which he has inſiſted upon it can ſignify nothing elſe, but *one Perſon*; and the criticiſm is thought to be of ſuch uſe and imporance to his Scheme, that his book *begins* with it; and in the courſe of his work it is repeated three times, nearly in the ſame words. But the Paſſage now before us, if he had produced it, would have turned his own weapon againſt himſelf. For the word εἷς is here an attribute of *Chriſt*; and if we argue from it in this place, as he has done in the other, it muſt prove, that *one perſon* only is our *Maſter*, and that this perſon is *Chriſt*: which excludes the Perſons of the *Father* and the *Spirit* from the honour of that title; and ſo reduces that learned author's reaſoning to a manifeſt abſurdity.

[1] Chap. ii. §. 3.

We

We are to conclude then, that as the Phraſe, *one Maſter*, cannot be meant to exclude the *Father*; ſo neither does that other—*one is good* (ſuppoſing that were the ſenſe of the *Greek*) or, *one is your Father*, exclude the perſon of *Chriſt*. And if the reaſon of the thing teaches us that it *cannot*, ſo the *Scripture* aſſures us in fact that it *does not*: the title of *Father*, being alſo aſcribed to the ſecond perſon of the Trinity. For *Chriſt*, the *Alpha* and *Omega*, ſays of himſelf—*He that overcometh ſhall inherit all things, and I will be* HIS GOD, *and he ſhall be* MY SON [1]. *Iſaiah* calls him—*The Everlaſting* FATHER [2]. And again it is written—*They are the* CHILDREN *of* GOD, *being the children of the* RESURRECTION [3]: But, ſays *Chriſt*—*I am the* RESURRECTION [4]: therefore he is *God*, and hath *us* for *his* Children. If this be the caſe, the word *Father* cannot always be a name that diſtinguiſhes *God* from *another perſon of God*; but is often to be underſtood as a term of *relation* between *God* and *Man*: or as a modern Divine of our Church has well expreſſed it —"A word not intended for *God the Father* only, the *Firſt* "*perſon* of the Trinity; but as it is referred unto the "*Creature*, made and conſerved by *God*; in which ſenſe the "appertains to the *whole Trinity*."

XXXV.

† *John* xiv. 28. MY FATHER is GREATER than I.

The two preceding Articles will ſufficiently juſtify what the Church has aſſerted with a view to this paſſage—That *Chriſt* is "*inferior to the* Father *as touching his* Manhood." And the ſtream of the whole Scripture is againſt that uſe the *Arians* generally make of it; who ſtand in need to be reminded at every turn, that in the perſon of *Chriſt*, there is a *human* ſoul and body, the nature of a *man*, which as it cannot lay claim to what is ſpoken of *Chriſt* in unity *with* the *Father*, ſo muſt it receive to its own account whatever ſeems to degrade and disjoin him *from* the *Father*. It is indeed hard to ſay, which of the two hereſies is the moſt

[1] Rev. xxi. 7. [2] ix. 6. [3] Luke xx. 36. [4] John xi. 25.

unreaſonable and unſcriptural; that of the *Socinians*, which never conſiders *Chriſt* as any thing but a *mere man*; or that of the *Arians*, who never look upon him as any thing but a *ſuppoſititious God*. Between theſe two groſs errors, lies the true Catholic Faith; which as it allows him to be *perfect God* and *perfect man*, is never offended, or put to its ſhifts, by any thing the Scripture may have ſaid about him in either capacity.

XXXVI.

† 1 *Cor.* xi. 3. The HEAD of *Chriſt* is GOD.

The name *Chriſt* does here ſtand, as in other places out of number, for the *man* Chriſt; otherwiſe it muſt follow, that as Chriſt is *God*, God is the head of *himſelf*; which is a contradiction; or that *one* God is the *head* of *another* God; which alſo is a contradiction.

This Text is capable of a good illuſtration from *Geneſ.* iii. 15. where we read, that the *heel* of the promiſed ſeed ſhould be *bruiſed*: by which the Church has always underſtood the ſufferings of his *human* nature, metaphorically repreſented by the *inferior* part in man. So in this place, his *Divinity* or *ſuperior nature* is as aptly ſignified by the *head* or *ſuperior* part of the human body.

XXXVII.

† *Mark* xiii. 32. But of that day and hour knoweth no man, no not the Angels which are in heaven, neither THE SON, but THE FATHER.

It is declared of *Chriſt* in another place, that he *increaſed in wiſdom* [1]: why ſhould it be incredible then, that during the whole term of his humiliation in the fleſh, ſomething ſhould ſtill be left, which as man upon earth he did not know? if you ſuppoſe him to be ignorant of this matter *as God*, how is it that St. *Peter* confeſſes him to be omniſcient, without receiving any rebuke for it, or being reminded of any particular exception?—LORD, *thou knoweſt* ALL THINGS [2].

[1] Luke ii. 52. [2] John xxi. 17.

XXXVIII.

XXXVIII.

† *John* i. 18. No man hath SEEN GOD at any time.
Ibid. xiv. 8, 9. *Philip* ſaith unto him, Lord SHEW US THE FATHER—haſt thou not SEEN ME, Philip? he that hath *ſeen* ME, hath *ſeen* THE FATHER.

"These words (ſays Dr. *Clarke*) do not ſignify, that he "who hath ſeen the *Perſon of Chriſt*, hath ſeen the *perſon of* "*the Father*." No ſurely; but that he who hath ſeen all that was viſible of Chriſt, hath ſeen the perſon, to whom was joined that inviſible and divine *Nature*, which the Scripture has called by the Name of *the Father*. And to ſhew that *Chriſt* (though he was *God* manifeſt *in the fleſh* [1]) is yet no other than the ſame *inviſible God*, whom no man hath or can *ſee* and *live*, we are told, that "*when he ſhall appear* "(glorified, not with any *ſecondary* divinity, but with the "FATHER's OWNSELF [2])—*we ſhall be* like *him* (*fa*-"*ſhioned* like *unto his own glorious body* [3], and *conformed to* "his *Image* [4]) *for we ſhall* SEE *him* AS HE IS;" which no man ever yet hath done.

XXXIX.

† 1 *Cor.* xv. 27. But when he ſaith all things are put under him, it is manifeſt that HE IS EXCEPTED (εκτος τȣ ȣποταξαντος) *which did put all things under him*. And when *all things* ſhall be SUBDUED (ȣποταγη) UNTO HIM—
Phil. iii. 20, 21. We look for THE SAVIOUR, the *Lord* JESUS CHRIST—who—IS ABLE even TO SUBDUE ALL THINGS (ȣποταξαι τα παντα) TO HIMSELF.

It is manifeſt, therefore, that the *exception* in the former text is not meant to ſet *one Perſon of God* above *another Perſon of God*; but only to diſtinguiſh the Power of the *Divine Nature* from that of the *human* in its greateſt *exaltation*. As *Chriſt* is *man*, *all things* are *ſubdued* unto him by ANOTHER;

[1] 1 Tim. iii. 16. [2] John xvii. 5. [3] Phil. iii. 21. [4] Rom. viii. 29.

as *Chriſt* is *God*, he himſelf *is* that *other*, and *able* to *ſubdue all things* to HIMSELF. And this will be ſufficient to confirm the Reader in what I have already obſerved, that the cauſe of *Arianiſm* borrows its chief ſupport from the *humiliation* of Chriſt *in the fleſh*. Search the very beſt of their arguments to the bottom, by a diligent *comparing* of the Scripture *with itſelf*, and they all amount to this great abſurdity—*Man* is *inferior* to *God*; therefore *God* is *inferior* to *himſelf*: and this they prove, by *imputing* to Chriſt's *Divinity* what is ſaid *only* of his *humanity*.

I have now preſented to the Reader's conſideration the moſt noted texts, which, under the management of *Arian* or *Socinian* Expoſitors, may ſeem to have favoured their Doctrine. Many, I hope, will be of opinion, that the Catholic cauſe is rather beholden to them, particularly in this laſt inſtance, for the oppoſition they have made againſt it; inaſmuch as the objections they have drawn from the holy Scriptures have directed us to ſome very clear proofs, which might otherwiſe have eſcaped our notice. If there be any other Texts more for their purpoſe than what I have here ſet down, they have my free conſent to produce and enlarge upon them as much as they pleaſe. In the mean time I ſhall proceed to give the Reader ſome farther ſatisfaction, and endeavour to convince him, with the Bleſſing of God, that while *Hereſy* is obliged to glean up a few ſcattered paſſages, hard to be underſtood, and for that reaſon, eaſy to be wreſted by men of perverſe inclinations; the Faith of the Church has the ſuffrage of the whole Bible, ſpeaking in ſuch words as need not be refined upon by any metaphyſical Expoſitions, but only applied and conſidered.

XL.

Jude 4. Denying the ONLY LORD GOD, and OUR LORD JESUS CHRIST—τον μονον δεσποτην θεον και Κυριον ημων Ιησουν Χριστον.

As there is no article before Κυριον, the firſt and ſecond comma are both meant of the ſame perſon; and the plain ſenſe,

ſenſe, when freed from the ambiguity of the Engliſh verſion, is this—*Denying the only Lord God and our Lord*, Jeſus Chriſt. This literal ſenſe of the Greek may be ſupported by the parallel Greek of *Phil.* iv. 20. Τῳ δε θεῳ και πατρι ημων. There being here no article before πατρι, it would be violent and unnatural, to refer θεος to one perſon, and πατρι to another: whence *Grotius* paraphraſes the expreſſion by—*Deo qui IDEM eſt Pater noſter*; and thus may the other be rendered with equal ſtrictneſs and propriety—δεσποτην *qui idem eſt* Κυριος ημων; and though we do not reſt the proof of the Trinity on any ſingle paſſage, yet is the more natural conſtruction of this text very ſtrong and concluſive for it.

If this ſhould be denied, I think the *ſenſe* alſo is capable of demonſtration. The words include this Propoſition—There is, ο μονος ΔΕΣΠΟΤΗΣ, *one ſupreme Governour*[1]: Now if this term be applied to *Chriſt*, it muſt follow that HE is that *one ſupreme Governour*, in the Unity of *the Father*. But it *is* applied to him in the parallel place of 2 *Pet.* ii. 1. *Denying* (ΔΕΣΠΟΤΗΝ) *the* Lord *that hath* bought *them*—τον αγορασαντα αυτους. And if it ſhould be doubted, whether this latter text be meant of *Chriſt*, it is demonſtrated by another—THOU *waſt ſlain, and haſt* BOUGHT *us* (ηγορασας) *unto God by thy Blood*[2]. If this chain of reaſoning be inverted, the force of it will be clear and undeniable. 1. *Chriſt* hath *bought* us. 2. He that hath *bought* us, is ΔΕΣΠΟΤΗΣ, *the Lord*, or *ſupreme Governour*. But 3dly, there is, ο μονος ΔΕΣΠΟΤΗΣ, *one only ſupreme Governour*. Therefore *Chriſt* is *he*.

XLI.

Jude 24, 25. Unto HIM that is able—to PRESENT you faultleſs before the PRESENCE of HIS GLORY—to the ONLY WISE GOD OUR SAVIOUR.

Eph. v. 27. That HE (*Chriſt*) might PRESENT it to HIMSELF a *glorious* Church, &c.

[1] So Dr. Clarke has conſtrued it, C. 1. §. 3. 411. [2] Rev. v. 9.

It is the *only wiſe God*, who is *able* to *preſent* us before the *preſence of his* Glory: but *Chriſt* is to *preſent* us, as members of the *Church* in *glory*, to *himſelf:* therefore *he* is the *only wiſe God*, to whom alſo appertains the *preſence of Glory*; for that is no other than his *own preſence, himſelf.*

This is another expreſs Inſtance, that μονῷ θεῷ, the *only God*, is not God in *one perſon*, but the *Unity of the Trinity.* For if you confine this phraſe, with the *Arians*, to the *ſingle Perſon* of *the Father*, then of courſe you exclude the *perſon* of *Chriſt*, and then, it is manifeſt, you contradict the Scripture. For though it be affirmed in this place, that the *only wiſe God* is to *preſent* us before his *own preſence*, yet the ſame is elſewhere expreſſed by *Chriſt preſenting us to himſelf.* Which is no way to be accounted for, unleſs you believe *Chriſt* to be a partaker in the *Being*, attributes, and offices of the one, undivided, *only wiſe God, our Saviour.* Then there is no farther difficulty.

XLII.

Eph. iii. 2, 3.—The Diſpenſation of the Grace of GOD, which is given me to you-ward: How that BY REVELATION HE (*God*) made known unto me the myſtery.

Gal. i. 12. I neither received it of man, neither was I taught it, but BY THE REVELATION OF JESUS CHRIST.

XLIII.

1 *Kings* viii. 39. THOU, even THOU ONLY KNOWEST the HEARTS of all the children of men.

This, it ſeems, is the privilege of *God* ONLY: but this *God* is *Chriſt*; for ſays he,

Rev. ii. 23. All the Churches ſhall know that I am HE which *ſearcheth* the reins and HEARTS.

Indeed this latter verſe ſpeaks plain enough for itſelf, without being compared with the former. It implies, that there

there is *one only* who *ſearcheth* the *hearts* of men, and that *Chriſt* is *he*. And the Greek will very well bear it; as the learned reader will eaſily perceive. It is thus—εγω ειμι ὁ ερευνων—There is ὁ ερευνων, *one that ſearcheth*; but—εγω ειμι—*I am He*.

XLIV.

2 *Pet.* i. 4.—*Exceeding great* and precious *promiſes*, that by theſe you might be (θειας κοινωνοι φυσεως) PARTAKERS of the DIVINE NATURE.

Hebr. iii. 14. For we are made (μετοχοι τȣ Χριϛȣ) PARTAKERS of CHRIST, if we hold the beginning of our confidence (in the *precious promiſes* of God) ſteadfaſt unto the end.

What St. *Peter* propoſes, as the end of our hope in the *promiſes*, is to be *partakers of the divine Nature*: but this, according to St. *Paul*, is to be *partakers of Chriſt*; therefore Chriſt is *in* or *of* the *Divine Nature*; the ſame *Almighty God*[1] and *Lord*, who declared to *Abraham*—*I am thy Shield, and thy* EXCEEDING GREAT REWARD[2]. So that theſe being compared together, are deciſive for the Catholic *Homoouſian* Doctrine, at which the *Arians*, from the Council of *Nice* to this very day, have been ſo grievouſly offended. And it has not been without reaſon. For if the word *Conſubſtantial* be applicable to the Perſon of *Chriſt*, it makes ſhort work with their *Hereſy*. To this end, it was fixed upon and agreed to by the Biſhops of the whole Chriſtian World *, as the moſt proper Bar and Badge of diſtinction between

[1] Gen. xvii. 1. [2] xv. 1.

* I ſay, of the *Whole Chriſtian World*: though a late Author calls this *Oecumenical Council*, ſummoned for the condemnation of *Arius*, "*a famous con-*"*teſt*;" as if one half of the world had been divided againſt the other. And he ſays, it was "determined by a *majority* of *near twenty to one*;" whereas, in truth, there were but *five* out of *three hundred and eighteen*, who denied the *Catholic Faith*. I mention this to ſhew how ſome things may be *repreſented* by ſome ſort of people, who if they are not *ignorant*, muſt think it their *Inte-*

between the *Arians* and themſelves. But they object, that the term is *not ſcriptural*; nay, there are ſome, of no ordinary figure amongſt them, who have not ſtuck to call it an invention of *Popery*[1]; though it is well known, that at the time this was adopted by the Church, there was no ſuch thing as *Popery* in the world. But the *name* is found to be of great uſe in amuſing weak people, who have no ready ſtock of learning to contradict them, and, in ſome caſes, I fear, no good deſire of being better informed. Who can think it a notable proof of their *zeal* as *Proteſtants*, that they take a pleaſure in ſeeing their poor Mother, the *Epiſcopal* church of *England*, the honour of the Reformation, and the dread of *Popery*, painted and dreſſed up for a *Jezebel*, by men *of her own houſhold*; who have ſhipwrecked their Conſciences by ſubſcribing Articles they never believed, and are growing fat upon the proviſion allotted by the Providence of God, only to ſupport the Church in her Journey through this world to the kingdom of heaven. A ſight that would raiſe the indignation of a *Mahometan!* and almoſt move a *Papiſt* himſelf to pity and pray for us!

But I hope there are ſome few among the favourers of *Arianiſm*, who are not gone quite ſo far out of the way, and would be aſhamed of ſuch low and baſe artifices, as can only ſerve to expoſe and diſcredit their cauſe with any man of common learning and honeſty. To theſe I addreſs myſelf: and now the *Scripture* is before us, let me aſk them a plain queſtion or two. Is not the word *Eſſence* or *Subſtance* of the ſame ſignification with the word *nature?* and have not the Fathers of the Church thus expounded it? and is not this phraſe—*of the ſame nature*—as concluſive for the *Divinity* of *Chriſt*, as that other—*of the ſame Subſtance?* why then ſhould that expreſſion of the *Nicene* Creed be thought

reſt to *impoſe* upon you. What would you think of a man, who having been preſent at an *Aſſize*, ſhould bring a report of it home to his family, and tell them he had been at a *famous Conteſt*, where there was a *majority* of *near ten* Jury-men, ſix witneſſes, and a Judge, againſt the *criminal?* See *Ded.* to an *Eſſay on Spirit*, p. 9, 10.

[1] Eſſay on Spirit, p. 151.

ſo

ſo offenſive, when there is another in the *Scripture* ſo near of kin to it, that the *Arians* muſt be ſenſible they could gain nothing by the Exchange? for the *divine Nature*, we all agree, can be but *one*; *three divine natures* of courſe making *three* different *Gods*. But the *Scripture*, compared as above, has aſſerted *Chriſt* to be *of this divine Nature*. And if people were once perſuaded of that, all farther diſputes about the word *Conſubſtantial* would be at an end. But peace and unity for *Chriſt*'s ſake, is a bleſſing of which God has deprived this Church for the puniſhment of it's ſins: and as we do not ſeem to be in any poſture of repentance, it is to be feared he will never reſtore it to us again in this world; but ſuffer us to go on from bad to worſe, till the meaſure is filled up.

XLV.

It is a rule, laid down by St. *Paul*, that GOD *ſwears by* HIMSELF, for this reaſon, *becauſe he can ſwear by* NO GREATER. *Heb.* vi. 13.

But *Chriſt* has *ſworn* by *himſelf*:

Iſai. xlv. 23. I have *ſworn* by MYSELF,—that unto me every knee ſhall bow, every tongue ſhall ſwear.

Which words being compared with *Rom.* xiv. 10, 11. are proved to be the words of *Chriſt*.—*We ſhall all ſtand before the judgment-ſeat of* Chriſt: *For it is written, as I live, ſaith the Lord, every knee ſhall bow to me, and every tongue ſhall confeſs unto God.*

Chriſt, therefore, has *ſworn* by HIMSELF: ſo that if the Apoſtle's rule be applied, he muſt for this reaſon be GOD, and there can be no GREATER.

XLVI.

Eph. iv. 8. When HE (*Chriſt*) aſcended up on high, he led captivity captive, and gave gifts unto men.

Yet

Yet the Scripture here referred to, expreſsly affirms the perſon who *aſcended*, &c. to be the *Lord God.*

Pſ. lxviii. 17, 18. The chariots of GOD are twenty thouſand, even thouſands of Angels: the LORD is among them, as in *Sinai*, in the holy Place. THOU *haſt aſcended on high*, THOU *haſt led captivity captive*, &c.

XLVII.

Heb. ix. 20. This is the Blood of the TESTAMENT which GOD hath *enjoined you.*

Ibid. v. 16. Where a TESTAMENT is, there muſt alſo of neceſſity be the DEATH of the TESTATOR.

God is a *Teſtator:* but, argues the *Apoſtle*, every *Teſtator* muſt *die*, before the laſt Will or *Teſtament enjoined* by him, can be *of force.* Therefore, if you keep cloſe to the terms, the natural concluſion is, that GOD, being a *Teſtator*, ſhould *die*, to make way for the *execution* of his *Teſtament.* But it being impoſſible that the divine nature of *God* ſhould be capable of *Death*; it follows, that the *perſon* who *was* capable of Death, and did *die* as a *man*, was alſo *God* the *Teſtator.* And it is to expreſs the ſtrict and perfect union of the *two natures* in the *ſingle perſon* of *Chriſt*, that what is true only of *one*, is predicated of *both.* Of this, two more examples ſhall be added in the articles that immediately follow.

XLVIII.

Rev. v. 9. THOU waſt ſlain, and haſt redeemed us to GOD by THY BLOOD.

A diſtinction is here obſerved between the two natures of *Chriſt:* and the act of *redeeming* us by the *ſhedding of his blood* is aſcribed to the *Lamb*, the *Meſſiah*'s *Humanity.* But in another place it is imputed to his Divinity—*Feed the Church of* GOD, *which he hath purchaſed with* HIS OWN BLOOD[1]: not that *God*, ſtrictly ſpeaking, has any *blood*

[1] Acts xx. 28.

of

of *his own* to ſhed; but that he who ſhed his blood for us, *as man*, was *God* as well as man: or, in other words, that *God* and *man* were *united in the ſame perſon*; ſomething being predicated of *God*, which cannot poſſibly be true without ſuch an union. So again—

XLIX.

Zech. xii. 4.—In that day ſaith THE LORD—V. 10. —they ſhall look on ME whom they have PIERCED.

But, according to the Evangeliſt St. *John*, this *Scripture ſaith*,

John xix. 37. They ſhall look on HIM (*Chriſt*) whom they have PIERCED.

As it ſtands in the Prophet, the *Lord* (*Jehovah*) was to be *pierced*. So that unleſs the man Chriſt, who hung upon the Croſs, was alſo the *Lord Jehovah*, the Evangeliſt is found to be a falſe witneſs, in applying to him a prophecy that could not poſſibly *be fulfilled* in him.

L.

Phil. i. 10. That ye may be ſincere and without offence, till the DAY of CHRIST.

2 *Pet.* iii. 12. Looking for and haſting to the coming of the DAY of GOD.

LI.

Iſai. xl. 10. *Behold*, the LORD GOD will COME— HIS REWARD IS WITH HIM.

Rev. xxii. 12. *Behold*, I (*Jeſus*) COME quickly, and MY REWARD IS WITH ME.

Amen: even ſo come LORD JESUS.

CHAP.

CHAP. II.

THE DIVINITY OF THE HOLY GHOST.

I.

John iii. 6. Το γεγενεμενον ΕΚ τȣ Πνευματος—That which is BORN OF the SPIRIT.

1 *John* v. 4. Το γεγεννημενον ΕΚ τȣ Θεȣ—whatſoever is BORN OF GOD.

The ſame individual act of divine Grace, *viz.* that of our ſpiritual birth, is aſcribed, without the change of a ſingle Letter, to *God*, and to the *Spirit*. Some *capacity* then there muſt be, wherein the *Scripture* makes no *diſtinction* between *God* and *the Spirit*:—and this is what the Scripture itſelf calls *the divine nature*; under which *God* and the *Spirit* are both *equally comprehended*.

II.

Acts xiii. 2. The HOLY GHOST ſaid, ſeparate ME *Barnabas* and *Saul* for the work whereunto I HAVE CALLED them.

Hebr. v. 4. No man taketh this honour to himſelf, but he that is CALLED of GOD.

The ſhorter way is to aſk this ſame *Saul*, *who* it was that appointed *him* to the *work of the miniſtry*? and his anſwer is no other than this—*Paul* CALLED to be an *Apoſtle*, SEPARATED unto the *Goſpel*—By the *commandment* of GOD OUR SAVIOUR [1].

[1] Rom. i. 1. and 1 Tim. i. 1.

III.

III.

Matth. ix. 38. Pray ye therefore the LORD OF THE HARVEST, that HE will SEND FORTH *Labourers* into his harveſt.

Acts xiii. 4. So they being SENT FORTH BY THE HOLY GHOST.

In this act of *ſending forth Labourers* upon the *work* of the Goſpel, the *Holy Ghoſt* is proved to be the *Lord of the Harveſt*, to whom *Chriſt* himſelf has directed us to PRAY. Wherefore, they are not to be heard, who adviſe us to alter the *third petition* in the *Litany*; a *work*, to which I am ſure the *Holy Ghoſt* hath not *called* us, and ſuch as will never be conſented to by any Labourers of *his* ſending.

IV.

Luke ii. 16. And it was revealed unto him (υπο [r]) BY the HOLY GHOST, that he ſhould not ſee Death, before he had ſeen the Lord's Chriſt.

Ibid. v. 28. And he BLESSED GOD, and ſaid, LORD now letteſt thou thy ſervant depart in peace, according to THY WORD.

This *word*, was the *word* of the *Holy Ghoſt*; who therefore is intitled to the context, and is *God* and *Lord* to be *bleſſed* or *praiſed*; not under any imaginary reſtrictions and limitations, according to a certain degree of Power delegated to him, an evaſion you will meet with in ſome modern writers; but the Scripture, and common reaſon inſtructed by the Scripture, diſclaim and abhor it, as an inlet to all ſorts of *Idolatry*.

[r] I ſet down the *prepoſition*, becauſe it ſlays the *Arian* with his own weapon. It ſhews the prime *agency* and *authority* in this affair to have been that of the *Holy Ghoſt*, acting in his own right, and not as the *miniſter* or *inſtrument* of an higher power; for then, according to them, it ſhould have been ἁ. For my own part, I lay no ſtreſs upon it; becauſe I perceive, upon a review of the Scripture, that theſe two prepoſitions are uſed indiſcriminately.

V.

V.

John xiv. 17. He (*the* SPIRIT *of Truth*) dwelleth with you, and ſhall be IN YOU.

1 *Cor.* xiv. 25. GOD is IN YOU of a truth.

VI.

2 *Tim.* iii. 16. All Scripture is given by INSPIRATION of GOD.

2 *Pet.* i. 21. Holy men of God ſpake as they were MOVED BY the HOLY GHOST.

VII.

John vi. 45. It is written in the prophets, and they ſhall be all TAUGHT of GOD.

1 *Cor.* ii. 13. Not in the words which *man's* wiſdom teacheth, *but* which the HOLY GHOST TEACHETH.

This latter verſe would prove the *Holy Ghoſt* to be *God* by itſelf: for I cannot find that *man*, in the ſtyle of the Scripture, is ever *oppoſed* in this manner to any *being* but *God* only. I will ſubjoin a few examples of it.

John i. 13. *Nor of the will of* man, but of God.

1 Theſſ. iv. 8. *He therefore that deſpiſeth, deſpiſeth not* man, *but* God.

Rom. i. 29. *Whoſe praiſe is not of* men, *but of* God.

VIII.

Acts v. 3. Why hath *Satan* filled thine heart to LYE to the HOLY GHOST?

Ibid. v. 4.—Thou haſt not LYED unto *men*, but unto GOD.

Dr. *Clarke* affirms, that "the Perſon of the *Holy Ghoſt* "is no where in Scripture expreſsly ſtiled *God*." And then adds by way of authority—"ſee the Text, No. 66[x]." And what *text* would you ſuppoſe this to be? why, it is no other

[x] Part II. §. xxxii.

than

than that of *Acts* v. 4. where he IS *expreſsly ſtiled God.* The *Doctor* refers us to it, becauſe he has added a long perplexed Comment to help us to *underſtand* it, I ſuppoſe; though a child may ſee the force of it without any Comment at all. The ſubſtance of all he has ſaid may be reduced to this—"*Ananias* lyed to *God*, becauſe he lyed to the Apoſtles, in whom *God dwelt* by his *Spirit.*" Thus he has tried to evade it; even by producing *one* proof of the *Holy Ghoſt's Divinity*, as an anſwer to *another.* For if the Scripture aſſures us that *God dwelleth* in us; and our only argument for it is, becauſe the *Spirit dwelleth* in us; who can the *Spirit* be, but *God himſelf?* as it is proved in the following Article. But before we proceed to it, I muſt beg the Reader to obſerve how he has uſed and repreſented *Athanaſius*'s opinion upon this text. "*Athanaſius* himſelf (ſays the Doctor [1]) explains "this text in *the ſame manner: He that lyed* (ſaith he) *to the* "*Holy Ghoſt, lyed to* GOD, WHO *dwelleth in men by his* "*Spirit. For* [2] *where the* Spirit *of God is, there is* GOD." The difference, then, between this author and St. *Athanaſius*, is no more than this: the former takes occaſion to *deny* that the *Holy Ghoſt* is GOD, the latter to *prove* it, and both from one and the ſame text; which, if you believe the *Doctor*, they have explained *in the ſame manner.*

IX.

1 *John* iii. 21. Beloved, if our heart condemn us not, then have we confidence toward GOD.

Ibid. v. 24. And *hereby* we know that HE abideth in us, by THE SPIRIT which he hath given us.

The Apoſtle's reaſoning is this—"*The Spirit* abideth in "us; and *hereby* we know that *He* (*God*) abideth in us." But unleſs the *Spirit* be a *perſon* in the *Unity of God*, the concluſion is manifeſtly falſe.

X.

1 *Cor.* iii. 16. The TEMPLE of GOD is holy, which temple are YE.

[1] No. 66. [2] Οπυ γαρ ες το Πνευμα τυ Θευ, εκει ες ο ΘΕΟΣ.

1 *Cor.* vi. 19. Know ye not, that YOUR BODIES are the TEMPLE of the HOLY GHOST?

XI.

Matt. iv. 1. Then was *Jeſus* LED up (υπο) BY THE SPIRIT, to be TEMPTED, &c.

Luke xi. 2.—4. OUR FATHER which art in heaven—LEAD us not into TEMPTATION.

Is it not my buſineſs in this place to ſhew particularly in *what manner* and for *what end* God *leads us into temptation.* That it is no way inconſiſtent with the divine attributes, is plain from the caſe now before us: for *Jeſus* was *led* up into the wilderneſs to meet his adverſary, and be *tempted* by him. And it is alſo plain from that petition in the Lord's Prayer, that *our father which is in heaven* would not *lead us into temptation:* it being needleſs and abſurd to *pray* that God would not do, what by the neceſſity of his nature, it is impoſſible for him to do. In this caſe, *God* is not the *tempter:* he only introduces us to the trial; and always provides, if we have the grace and prudence to embrace it, *a way for our eſcaping, that we may be able to bear it.*

But when *Jeſus* was *tempted*, the *leading him into temptation* was the act of the *Holy Spirit.* Therefore as often as we repeat the *Lord's Prayer*, we addreſs ourſelves incluſively to the *Perſon* of the *Spirit*, under the one name of OUR FATHER; and certainly, he alſo is *our Father*, of whom we are *begotten* and *born*, even *of the Spirit:* and again, *as many as are* LED *by the* SPIRIT of *God, they are the* SONS *of God.* Rom. viii. 14. See Art. I. of this Chapter.

XII.

2 *Cor.* i. 3. Bleſſed be GOD, even the GOD of ALL COMFORT.

If *all* ſpiritual Comfort (ſent *from heaven*) be of *God*, how is it conſiſtent, that *the churches had reſt——walking in the* COMFORT OF *the* HOLY GHOST[1], unleſs the *Holy*

[1] Acts ix. 3.

Ghoſt be a perſon in the Unity of *God?* and how can *he* be ſtyled by way of Eminence, THE *Comforter* [1], if there be a *God* diſtinct from him, who claims that Title? for then he is not *the Comforter*, but *one* of the *two*; and *two divine Comforters*, like *two Almighties*, would make *two Gods*; which is not a principle of Chriſtianity, but of heathen Idolatry. And the ſame reaſoning will hold good as to another of his titles. For the *Holy Ghoſt* is called, by way of Eminence, THE SPIRIT [2], i. e. the true and principal, the head and Father of all *other Spirits*. Yet we are told that *God* is *a Spirit* [3]: ſo that unleſs the *Spirit* be alſo *God*, we muſt believe in *two* ſupreme, diſtinct, and independent *Spirits*. And thus we juſtly argue for the Divinity of *Chriſt*; that becauſe GOD *is* LIGHT [4], and *Chriſt* is THE LIGHT [5], therefore, he is and muſt be *God*; even the TRUE *God*, becauſe he is the TRUE *Light* [6].

XIII.

1 *Cor.* ii. 11. For what man knoweth the things of a man, ſave the SPIRIT of a man which is IN HIM? EVEN ſo the things of GOD knoweth (ουδεις) none but the SPIRIT OF GOD.

The *Spirit* of a *man* knows the things of a man for *this* reaſon, becauſe it is *in him*. For the *ſame* reaſon, the *Spirit* of *God* knows the things of *God*, becauſe it is *in* the *Godhead*; than which nothing farther need be deſired to prove the *co-eſſentiality* of the *Holy Ghoſt* [7]. If you take it otherwiſe, there can be no parallel between the two caſes. For how ſtrange would it be to ſay—the *human Spirit* knows the things of a *man*, becauſe it is *in him*; EVEN SO, the *Divine Spirit* knows the things of *God*, becauſe it is *out of him*. This text brings the matter to a ſhort iſſue. The

[1] Ὁ παρακλητος, John xiv. 26. [2] 1 John v. 6. [3] John iv. 24.
[4] 1 John i. 5. [5] John i. 4, 7, 8. and viii. 12. [6] Ibid. i. 9.
[7] The *Scripture* uſes the ſame *prepoſition* to denote the *co-eſſentiality* of *Chriſt*—*John* xiv. 11. *I am* (ΕΝ τω Πατρι) In *the Father*. And xiii. 32. *God ſhall glorify him* (ΕΝ ἑαυτω) In *Himſelf*.

Church affirms the *Spirit* to be *in God*, as a *perſon* of the *ſame divine nature*: the *Arians* deny it, and will underſtand him to be *out of* God; not a perſon of the divine nature, but one inferior to, and diſtinct from it. To ſee on which ſide the truth lies, a man needs no other qualification but that of *faith*, to receive the *Scripture* as the infallible *word of God*: which the *Arians*, in moſt of their writings, have freely confeſſed it to be. If once they come openly to deny this, they are no longer *Arians*, but infidels of another denomination, with whom a different courſe is to be taken.

XIV.

1 *Cor.* ii. 11. The THINGS OF GOD knoweth no man.

Ibid. v. 14. But the natural man receiveth not the THINGS OF THE SPIRIT OF GOD.

Here again, the Scripture makes no diſtinction, farther than that of perſonality, between *God* and the *Spirit* of *God*; but renders unto *God* the *things* that are *God*'s, by rendering them to the *Spirit*, who *is God*.

XV.

Deut. vi. 16. and *Matt.* iv. 7. Thou ſhalt not TEMPT the LORD thy GOD.

Acts v. 9. How is it that ye have agreed to TEMPT the SPIRIT of the LORD?

The Spirit is here ſubſtituted as the object of that particular act of diſobedience, of which, according to the *Law* and the *Goſpel*, the only object is the *Lord our God*: therefore the *Spirit* is the *Lord our God*.

Dr. *Clarke* denies that in "*any place of Scripture there is* "*any mention made of any* SIN *againſt the* Holy Ghoſt, *but* "*only of a* BLASPHEMY[1]." He that can diſtinguiſh BLASPHEMY from SIN, muſt be an acute reaſoner; when it is of *all ſins* the greateſt. But is it no SIN againſt

[1] S. D. p. 112.

the

the *Holy Ghoſt*, to *lye* to him, to *grieve* him [1], or to *tempt* him? why then did the Lord *ſwear* in his *wrath* againſt thoſe that *grieved* him, if it were no SIN? and why was that commandment given in the Law, *thou ſhalt not* tempt *the Lord thy God?* And if the *Spirit* be *tempted*, is not *the Spirit* the object *offended* by that *temptation?* this is the very thing that learned man was afraid of. He would have proved *blaſphemy* to be no *Sin*, leſt the *Spirit* ſhould appear to be the *object* of *Sin*; for that would have proved him to be *God*, the author and giver of the *Law:* and that, again, would have ſpoiled his *Scripture Doctrine:* ſo the ſhort way was, to *deny* it.

XVI.

Gen. vi. 3. And the LORD ſaid, MY SPIRIT ſhall not *always ſtrive with man.*

The *Spirit of the Lord* ſtrove with the Inhabitants of the old world, endeavouring to reclaim them by grace, and *waiting* long for their repentance. But this is called, 1 *Pet.* iii. 20. the *long-ſuffering* of GOD that *waited* in the days of *Noah.*

XVII.

Luke xi. 20. If I with the FINGER of GOD *caſt out devils.*

The parallel place in St. *Matthew*'s Goſpel has it thus:

Matth. xii. 28. If I with the SPIRIT of GOD *caſt out devils.*

The *finger of God* is a metaphorical expreſſion for the immediate *power* and *agency* of God: and to ſay that *Devils were caſt out* by the *finger of God*, is the ſame as to ſay, that they were caſt out by *God himſelf.* But it appears from the text of St. *Matthew*, that this particular act of the *finger of God*, that is, of *God himſelf*, was the act of the SPIRIT; therefore, the *Spirit* is *God himſelf.*

[1] Eph. iv. 30.

XVIII.

Ezek. viii. 1—3. The hand of the LORD GOD fell there upon me——and HE (the *Lord God*) put forth the form of an hand, and *took me* by a lock of mine head, and the SPIRIT *lift me up*, &c.

In this text, the name of the *Lord God*, and the name of the *Spirit*, do both belong to the ſame *perſon*. For though it be ſaid that the *Spirit lifted up* the prophet, yet was it no other than the *Lord God* who *put forth the form of an hand, and took him:* therefore the SPIRIT is the LORD GOD.

XIX.

Acts iv. 24, 25.—They lift up their voice to God with one accord, and ſaid, LORD, *thou* art GOD, which haſt made heaven and earth, and the ſea, and all that therein is. WHO *by the mouth* of thy ſervant DAVID has *ſaid*, &c.

The terms LORD and GOD are here uſed to expreſs the Divinity of *him*, who ſpake *by the mouth* of his ſervant *David*. But it was the *perſon* of the HOLY GHOST, who *ſpake by the mouth of* his ſervant *David*—for, ſaith St. *Peter—This Scripture muſt needs have been fulfilled, which the* HOLY GHOST by the mouth *of* DAVID *ſpake*, &c. Therefore, the terms LORD and GOD are certainly uſed to *expreſs the Divinity* of the HOLY GHOST.

So again;

It was the LORD GOD of *Iſrael*, who SPAKE by the mouth of his holy *Prophets*, ſince *the world began*. *Luke* i. 68. 70.

But then, it is written——well SPAKE the HOLY GHOST by *Eſaias* the *prophet*[1], &c. Therefore the *Holy Ghoſt* is the LORD GOD of *Iſrael*.

[1] Acts xxviii. 25.

XX.

XX.

Pſal. cxxxix. 7. Whither ſhall I go from THY SPIRIT? or whither ſhall I go from thy *Preſence?* If I aſcend up into heaven, THOU art there.

The Pſalmiſt, to acknowledge the omnipreſence of the *Holy Ghoſt*, ſays—*Whither ſhall I go from* thy Spirit? and by what is immediately ſubjoined, he ſhews this to be the omnipreſence of *God himſelf*——*If I aſcend up into heaven*, THOU *art there*. So that the terms *Thou*, and *thy Spirit*, are equivalent; i. e. equally concluſive for the immediate *preſence* of the *divine nature itſelf*.

XXI.

It was ſaid by the Angel—*Luke* i. 32.—*He ſhall be great, and ſhall be called the* SON *of the* HIGHEST. But the reaſon given upon this occaſion WHY Chriſt was called the SON OF GOD, is this, and this only, *viz.* becauſe he was begotten by the *Holy Ghoſt*—"The Holy Ghoſt ſhall come "upon thee, and the power of the HIGHEST ſhall over-"ſhadow thee: THEREFORE alſo that holy thing which "ſhall be born of thee ſhall be called the Son of GOD." v. 35.

When *Jeſus* is called *the Son of God*, we underſtand the *ſupreme* and *true God*, beſides whom there is no other. The *Devils* themſelves allowed it, and ſaid—"*Jeſus*, thou Son "of God MOST HIGH[1]!" But the Perſon in God, whoſe Son Jeſus is ſaid to be in this place, is the *Holy Ghoſt*, by whoſe power (called the *Power of the higheſt*) he was begotten of the bleſſed virgin, and thence *called the Son of God*.

Therefore, the *Holy Ghoſt* is *God*, and the *Higheſt*.

XXII.

The Prophet *Iſaiah*, in his 6th Chapter, tells us he ſaw the LORD OF HOSTS. And at ver. 8. that he heard the voice of the LORD, SAYING—*Go and tell this people, hear ye indeed, but underſtand not*, &c.

[1] Luke viii. 28.

Yet theſe very words, which the prophet declares to have been *ſpoken* by the *Lord*, even the *Lord of Hoſts*, were ſpoken by the *Holy Ghoſt—Well* SPAKE THE HOLY GHOST, *by* Eſaias *the prophet, unto our Fathers*, ſaying, *Go unto this People, and ſay, hearing ye ſhall hear, and ſhall not underſtand*[1], &c.

Therefore, the HOLY GHOST is the LORD OF HOSTS.

The article of the Holy Ghoſt's ſupreme and abſolute Divinity being now eſtabliſhed in the plaineſt terms, I ſhall proceed to anſwer, from the Scripture, the objections uſually made againſt it from thence.

XXIII.

† *Matth.* xix. 17. There is none GOOD but ONE, that is, GOD.

If this be a good objection to the Divinity of *Chriſt*, it muſt be equally ſtrong againſt that of the Holy Ghoſt; for it is argued from this paſſage, that the attribute of *goodneſs* is confined to the *ſingle perſon* of God the Father; who therefore is a Being ſuperior to, and different from *Chriſt* and the *Holy Ghoſt*. The Error of this argument has been fully ſhewn above: for it is not *one perſon*, but *one God*, whom the Scripture has aſſerted to be *good*; and I now have an opportunity of confirming it, and of proving withal, that in the unity of this one God, beſides whom no other is *good*, the perſon of the Holy Ghoſt is, and muſt be included. For it is written—*Thy* SPIRIT *is* GOOD[2]—ſo that if the ſame inſpired Scripture which declares the perſon of the *Spirit* to be *good*, does alſo as plainly declare that *none* is *good*, but *God only*; then the Spirit is God, even the only true and ſupreme God; and we are as well aſſured of it, as if it had been ſaid, "there is none Good but one, "that is *the Spirit*, who is one with God." The Hebrew in this place is yet ſtronger than the Engliſh. It is not טוב *good*, but טובה *Goodneſs itſelf*, that is, divine eſſential un-

[1] Acts xxviii. 26, 27. [2] Pſal. cxliii. 10.

communicated goodneſs, beſides which there neither is nor can be any other of the like kind. There is one ſort of goodneſs communicated to men upon earth; as we read, *Pſal.* cxii. 5. *the* good *man ſheweth* favour, &c. and *Acts* ii. 24. that *Barnabas was a* good *man, and full of faith*, &c. There is another ſort of goodneſs to be found only in heaven, and that is the goodneſs of God, which is eſſential; but this goodneſs is alſo an attribute of the *Spirit*; who therefore is proved to be *very God*; and by that argument too, for the ſake of which, ſome have *denied* him to be God.

XXIV.

† *Matth.* iii. 16. The *Spirit* OF GOD.

The Spirit, ſay they, is not *God*, becauſe he is only the Spirit *of* God. But ſo likewiſe the *human Spirit*, whence the Apoſtle has taught us to borrow an Idea of the *Divine*, is the Spirit OF *a man*; yet, was it ever pretended, that the *Spirit*, for this reaſon, is *one* Being, and the *man* another? No, certainly: and the ſame muſt be true of *God*, and the Spirit *of* God; as far as the Being of the *ſame man*, who is *one* perſon, can be an image of the *ſame God*, who is *three* perſons. But there is the plaineſt teſtimony of Scripture, that the Spirit, though ſaid to be the *Spirit* OF *Jehovah*, is alſo called by the expreſs name of *Jehovah* himſelf. For it is written, *Judg.* xv. 14. that the *Spirit* OF *Jehovah* CAME upon *Samſon*. Yet at Chap. xvi. 20. it is ſaid, that *Jehovah* himſelf DEPARTED *from him*. Till it can be ſhewn, then, that the perſon who *came* upon him was *one*, and the perſon who *departed from him* was *another*; it is undeniable, that the *Spirit*, though ſaid to be OF *Jehovah*, is ſtrictly and properly *Jehovah himſelf*.

XXV.

† *Heb.* ii. 4. GOD alſo bearing them witneſs with —*gifts* of the *Holy Ghoſt* according to his OWN will.

Hence it is objected, that the *Holy Ghoſt* is ſubſervient and ſubordinate to the Will of *another*; therefore he cannot

be the ſupreme and true God. But if this *own will* of *God* ſhould prove to be no other than the *will* of the *Spirit*, this imaginary objection of the *Arians*, which if it be an *error* muſt alſo be a *blaſphemy*, will turn to a demonſtration againſt them. And that the *will* of *God* really is the *will* of the *Spirit*, is manifeſt from 1 *Cor.* xii. 11. *All theſe worketh that one and the ſelf-ſame* SPIRIT, *dividing to every man ſeverally as* HE (even *he himſelf*) WILLETH.

XXVI.

† *Rom.* viii. 26. The *Spirit* itſelf *maketh interceſſion for us.*

The *Spirit* is not *God*, becauſe he *maketh interceſſion* with God; and God, as it is imagined, cannot *intercede* with *himſelf*. But it is a matter of fact, that he has actually done this: therefore it is wicked and falſe to ſay that he *cannot*. For God *reconciled* the world TO HIMSELF, and it was done by *Interceſſion*.

The other Objections I meet with are all of this ſtamp: as that the Spirit is ſaid to be *given*, to *proceed*, to be *poured out*, to be *ſent*; and they argue that it is impoſſible for God to *give*, to *proceed* from, or to *ſend*, *himſelf*. But here the queſtion is begged, that *God* is but *one perſon*, in which caſe it might be a contradiction: but the Scriptures demonſtrate, as it will be ſeen in the following Chapter, that *God* is *three perſons*; and then there is no contradiction in any of theſe things. It is alſo to be obſerved, that the *giving*, *proceeding*, *ſending*, and *miniſtration* of the Eternal *Spirit* to *Chriſt* in Glory, are terms that concern not the divine *nature*, but relate merely to the *acts* and *offices*, which the ſeveral *perſons* of the bleſſed Trinity have mercifully condeſcended to take upon them, for conducting the preſent Œconomy of man's *redemption* and *ſanctification*.

By this time, I take it for granted, every pious reader muſt have obſerved, how very copious and concluſive the *Scriptures* of the *Old Teſtament* are, upon the ſubject of the *Trinity*; and that without having recourſe to them upon every occaſion,

occaſion, it is impoſſible for me or for any man to deal fairly and honeſtly by the *Apoſtolical Doctrine* of the Church of *England*. Our *Lord* himſelf has told us, that *every Scribe, or* teacher, *inſtructed into the kingdom of heaven, ſhould bring forth out of his treaſure, things* NEW and OLD [1]. It was his own practice. He appealed, at every turn, to the *Law*, the *Prophets*, and the *Pſalms*, for the teſtimony of his own doctrine; and the Church has followed his example, from the days of the Apoſtles, *almoſt* down to the preſent times. And ſo far is the Old Teſtament from being no part of the Scripture, that it is the book, and the only book, the Goſpel calls by the name of *the Scripture*. It was this book, which the *noble* and faithful *Beræans* ſearched every day of their lives, to ſee whether the Goſpel then preached, and afterwards publiſhed in the *New Teſtament*, was agreeable to it; with the intention, either to receive or reject it, as it ſhould appear to be recommended by this Authority. It was this Book, for his ſkill in which, *Apollos* is praiſed as one *mighty in the Scriptures*; the ſame Scriptures, of which St. *Paul* was bold to affirm, for the benefit of a brother *Chriſtian*, that they were *able to make him wiſe unto ſalvation, through* Faith *that is in Chriſt Jeſus*. As long as *this Faith* flouriſhed in the Church, theſe Scriptures were much read and profitably underſtood: but now it is dwindled into a dry lifeleſs Syſtem of Morality, they are become in a manner uſeleſs; and ſome (it grieves me to ſay it) even of thoſe who have undertaken to *teach others*, want themſelves to be *taught again* this firſt Element of Chriſtianity, that the *New Teſtament* can never be underſtood and explained, but by comparing it with the *Old*.

Of this Error and its conſequences, we have a ſad example in the celebrated Dr. *Clarke*; a man, whoſe talents might have adorned the Doctrine of Chriſt, had not his *Faith* been eaten up by an Heathen Spirit of Imagination and Philoſophy. He publiſhed a Book entitled, *The Scripture Doctrine of the Trinity*; a work of great pains and premeditation. In a ſhort preface, he allows the Subject to be

[1] Matt. xiii. 52.

of the greateſt importance in religion—not to be treated of careleſsly—but *examined by a ſerious ſtudy of the* WHOLE SCRIPTURE. And to convince the world that this and no other was *his own* practice, he affirms in his *Introduction*, p. 17. and prints it in *capitals*, that he has collected ALL *the Texts* relating to that matter. Yet his whole Collection is finiſhed and ſhut up without a Single Text from the *Old Teſtament!* I cannot find that he has even mentioned ſuch a Book. "The Chriſtian Revelation," ſays he, p. 1. "is the "Doctrine of Chriſt and his Apoſtles." This he calls, p. 4. "—"The *Books of Scripture*;" and again, p. 5.—"The "*Books of Scripture*—not only *the Rule*, but *the Whole and* "*the only Rule of Truth*—the only Foundation we have to "go upon." And he proves it thus—"becauſe no man "has ſince pretended to have any new Revelation." An argument that will prejudice few people in favour of his ſincerity. For though there has been no *new Revelation* SINCE the Books of the New Teſtament, as we all confeſs: does it follow that there was no *old Revelation* BEFORE them? and did this author never read, that the ſame GOD, *who ſpake in theſe laſt days by* his Son, *ſpake in time paſt unto the fathers by the* Prophets [1]? yet he affects to know nothing at all of the matter.

And as to the uſe he makes of the *New Teſtament*, who would expect, that a man who has made *Nothing* of *one half* of God's Revelation, ſhould be very nice in his treatment of the *other?* In the firſt place, he has not vouchſafed to follow the Apoſtle's Direction of *comparing ſpiritual things with ſpiritual*, thence to collect their true meaning; but ſets down his Texts in ſuch an order, as makes them to be all ſingle and independent of one another; and that gives all poſſible liberty to the Imagination to thruſt in what ſort of comment it pleaſes. When he refers to any parallel place (which I think is *never* done, but on *one* ſide of the Queſtion) the Reader is not directed to the text itſelf, but to the *meaning* he has faſtened upon it. At the beginning of every

[1] Heb. i. 1.

chapter,

chapter, he ſets down his *own opinion* at large, as the *Title* of it: and you are to believe, that all the paſſages of that Diviſion do certainly prove it; which if cleared of his comments, and compared with other texts, are found to prove no ſuch thing, but the very contrary. And this he calls *The Scripture Doctrine of the Trinity:* but if we call it by its true name, it is—Clarke's *Doctrine of the Scripture*; that is, of *half* the Scripture. How it came to paſs, that he ſhould thus boldly ſet down his own reſolutions upon the moſt profound article of the *Chriſtian* Faith, without conſulting *all* the Evidence that relates to it, or rightly examining *any part of it: how* this came to paſs, God is to determine, to whom all things are naked and open. All I have to do with him, is to reſcue the *Word of God* from ſuch *deceitful handling*. And I have prevailed with myſelf to make theſe few Reflections, becauſe I find ſome modern Objectors of a lower Claſs, have uſed this Book in Converſation and in Print, as the Oracle of the Party, taking the *Scripture* upon truſt as his principles would give him leave to retail it. I know it will be accounted an *hard thing*, and called *invidious*, to rake thus into the *Aſhes* of a writer, who is not alive to anſwer for himſelf. And I confeſs, I am very far from taking any *pleaſure* in it. But is it not much *harder*, that the aſhes of this man ſhould be ſcattered over the land, to breed and inflame the plague of hereſy, till the whole *head* is ſick and the *heart faint*, and the *whole body* full of putrifying blains and ſores? *Arianiſm* is now no longer a *peſtilence* that walketh in *darkneſs*, but that brazens it out againſt the ſun's light, and *deſtroyeth* in the *noon day*. It is a *canker*, which if it be *encouraged* much longer, will certainly *eat* out the vitals of *Chriſtianity* in this kingdom: and when the *faith* is gone, the *Church* in all probability will ſoon follow after it; for if the holy oil be waſted and ſpilt, the Lamp that was made to hold it, will be of no farther uſe.

CHAP

CHAP. III.

THE PLURALITY AND TRINITY OF PERSONS.

I.

The *Hebrew* name ſo often uſed in the *Old Teſtament*, which we have tranſlated by the word *God*, is *Elohim*, a noun ſubſtantive of the *plural* number, regularly formed from its *ſingular* *, and very frequently joined with plural verbs and plural adjectives, to expreſs a *plurality* in the divine nature: though for another obvious reaſon, it is generally conſtructed with verbs and pronouns of the ſingular number, and gives a good ſenſe, though the Grammar of it be ſomewhat irregular.

The *Jews* would perſuade us not to conſider this word as a plural noun, but on ſome particular occaſions. Whoever will be at the pains to examine their reaſoning, will find it to be very childiſh and inconſiſtent, wholly owing to their hatred againſt the divinity of *Jeſus Chriſt*, and the notion of a Trinity. But when the *Jew* is become a *Chriſtian*, and the ſtumbling-block of the *Croſs* removed out of his way, he can allow the name *Elohim* to be *plural* as readily as other men; and it is one of the principal points he chuſes to inſiſt upon, to convince the world that his eyes are open, and he is ſincere in his profeſſion of the *Chriſtian* religion.

John Xeres, a *Jew*, converted here in *England* about forty years ago, publiſhed a ſenſible and affectionate addreſs to his unbelieving brethren, wherein he lays before them his *reaſons for leaving the Jewiſh religion and embracing the Chriſtian*. "The Chriſtians, (ſays he †) confeſs *Jeſus* to be *God*; and "it is this that makes us look upon the Goſpels as books

* אלוה and אלה: ſee the Heb. of Deut. xxxii. 17. and Hab. i. 11.

† P. 53.

"that

" that overturn the very principles of religion, the truth of " which is built upon this article, the *Unity of God.* In " this argument lies the ſtrength of what you object againſt " the Chriſtian religion." Then he undertakes to prove that the unity of God is not ſuch as he once underſtood it to be, an unity of *Perſon*, but of *Eſſence*, under which more perſons than one are comprehended; and the firſt proof he offers is that of the name *Elohim.* " Why elſe, (ſays he *) " is that frequent mention of *God* by nouns of the plural " number? as in *Gen.* i. 1. where the word *Elohim*, which " is rendered *God*, is of the plural number, though annexed " to a verb of the ſingular number; which demonſtrates as " evidently as may be, that there are ſeveral perſons par- " taking of the ſame divine Nature and Eſſence."

II.

Gen. i. 26. And GOD ſaid, let us make man in OUR image, after OUR likeneſs.

No ſenſible reaſon can be given, why God ſhould ſpeak of himſelf in the *plural* number, unleſs he conſiſts of more perſons than one. Dr. *Clarke* contrived the plan of his *Scripture Doctrine* ſo as to leave out this difficulty with many more of the ſame kind. Others there are who tell us it is a figurative way of ſpeaking, only to expreſs the dignity of God, not to denote any *plurality* in him. For they obſerve it is cuſtomary for a King, who is only one perſon, to ſpeak of himſelf in the ſame ſtyle. But how abſurd is it, that God ſhould borrow his way of ſpeaking from a King, before a man was created upon the earth! And even granting this to be poſſible, yet the caſes will not agree. For though a King or Governor may ſay *us* and *we*, there is certainly no figure of ſpeech that will allow any ſingle perſon to ſay, *one of us*, when he ſpeaks only of *himſelf.* It is a phraſe that can have no meaning, unleſs there be more perſons than one to chuſe out of. Yet this, as we ſhall find, is the Style in which God has ſpoken of himſelf in the following article.

* P. 57.

Though

Though it be impoſſible to apply this plural expreſſion to any but the Perſons of the Godhead, there is a writer who has attempted to turn the force of it by another text, in which, as he ſays very truly, *the weakneſs of the argument will appear at ſight*. God invites the people by the prophet *Iſaiah*, and ſays, "Come now and *let us reaſon* together." chap. i. ver. 18. Upon which he remarks, that, "if this "form of expreſſion puts the children of *Iſrael* upon an "equality with God, then we may allow ſome force in "this argument [1]."

And ſo we may if it does not. For *let us reaſon* refers to an act common to all ſpirits; and therefore no Chriſtian ever thought of arguing from it. But *let us make man* refers only to an act of the Godhead. All ſpirits can *reaſon:* but only the ſupreme Spirit can *create*. Therefore the author, inſtead of anſwering the expreſſion, hath only brought together two texts as widely different as God and man.

If the King were to ſay to another, "let us *ſee*," or let "us *breathe*," no man would be ſo weak as to think that the expreſſion denoted any equality or co-ordination in the perſon ſo ſpoken to. But if he ſhould ſay, "let us pardon "a malefactor condemned by the law," then the expreſſion would admit of ſuch an inference. And the objector might have been aware of theſe diſtinctions, if he had not prematurely ſettled his faith before he had conſulted the Holy Scripture.

III.

Gen. iii. 22. And the LORD GOD ſaid, behold the man is become like ONE OF US.

The *Jews* are greatly perplexed with this paſſage. They endeavour to put it off, by telling us, God muſt here be underſtood to ſpeak of himſelf and his *council*, or as they term it בית דין his *houſe of judgment*, made up of angels, &c. to which there needs no anſwer but that of the prophet,

[1] See an *Appeal to the Common Senſe of all Chriſtian People*, p. 139.

who

who hath known the mind of the Lord, or who hath been his counſellor [1]?

IV.

Gen. xi. 6, 7. And the LORD ſaid—let us go down and there confound (*Heb.* let US confound) their language.

Another inſtance of this occurs in *Iſaiah* vi. 8. *I heard the voice of the* LORD, *ſaying, whom ſhall I ſend, and who will go for* US? Upon the plural word *Nobis*, us, there is a ſhort note of *Junius* and *Tremellius*, which contains the ſubſtance of all that can be ſaid upon the occaſion—"*Nam* "*conſilium eſt Dei Patris, Filii, & Spiritus Sancti*"—*For this* (ſay they) *is a conſultation of God the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghoſt.*—And it ſhall be proved to be ſo, in a proper place, from an inſpired comment upon this Chapter of *Iſaiah*.

V.

Geneſ. xx. 13. And it came to paſs when GOD *cauſed me to wander* from my father's houſe, &c.

The *Hebrew* is—*Deus errare facerent*—*God* they *cauſed me to wander:* which, however ſtrange it may ſound to an *Engliſh* hearer, is the ſtrict grammatical rendering of the original. And the expreſſion is affirmed by *Junius* and *Tremellius*, with other commentators out of number, to reſpect the plurality of the perſons in the Godhead. They have a ſhort note upon it to the following effect—*Plurale verbum cum Dei nomine, ad indicandum* S. Triados *myſterium:* which I mention, not in the way of an *authority*, but only to ſhew how clear the caſe is to an *Hebrew* reader, whoſe mind is without prejudice. And though others may have attempted to conceal ſuch evidence as this under an heap of critical rubbiſh, yet if we are to come to no reſolution till thoſe who diſlike the *doctrine* of a Trinity have done diſputing about the *words* that convey it, the day of judgment itſelf would find us undetermined. And if we

[1] Rom. xi. 34. and Iſai. xl. 13.

would

would but attend to this ſtate of the caſe, and apply it alſo to other points of doctrine, I am well convinced it would ſhorten many of our diſputes, and make the word of God a much more eaſy and intelligible book than it paſſes for at preſent.

VI.

Gen. xxv. 7. Becauſe there GOD *appeared* unto him, &c.

Here again the *Hebrew* verb is *plural—Deus revelati ſunt —God* they *appeared*, or *were revealed to him.* So again in 2 *Sam.* vii. 23.—*even like Iſrael whom* God went *to redeem:* which in the original is—*iverunt Deus ad redimendum*; the verb being in the *plural.* A celebrated *Latin* tranſlator [1] of the Old Teſtament has ventured to render it—*iverunt* Dii *ad redimendum:* but *Dii* in Latin is not anſwerable to *Elohim* in the *Hebrew*; and, in ſtrictneſs, may be thought to countenance the notion of *Tritheiſm*, or a plurality of *Gods*; which is abhorrent from the expreſs doctrine of the Scripture; and againſt which the name *Elohim* is purpoſely guarded, by its being connected ſo very often with verbs and pronouns in the *ſingular.*

VII.

Deut. iv. 7. What nation is there ſo great, that hath GOD *ſo nigh* unto them? &c.

In the two preceding articles we have ſeen the name of God connected with *plural verbs:* it is here joined to a *plural adjective*, whoſe termination is the ſame with its own; for the original has it—*Elohim Kerebim—Deus propinqui—God who* are *ſo near.* Another inſtance of which we have in *Joſh.* xxiv. 19. *Ye c nnot ſerve the Lord, for he is an* holy God. For the *Hebrew* reads it—*Deus* ſancti *ipſe,—he is a God who* are holy ones. And again, *Pſal.* lviii. 12. *Doubtleſs there is a* God that judgeth *the earth:* the Hebrew of which is—*Deus* judicantes *in terra—a God* (i. e. divine perſons) *who* are judging *in the earth.*

[1] *Pagninus* in his interlineary verſion publiſhed by *Montanus.*

VIII.

VIII.

Several other nouns there are beſide the name *Elohim*, as well adjective as ſubſtantive, that are ſet down in the plural number, where it cannot be denied that the Being of *God* is to be underſtood by them.

Mal. i. 6. If I be a MASTER, where is my fear? The *Heb.* is אדנים *Adonim*, in the *plural—If I am* maſters, &c.

Iſai. liv. 5. *For thy Maker is thine huſband, the Lord of Hoſts is his name.* Here alſo the Hebrew ſubſtantives for *thy maker* and *thy huſband*, are both plural—בעליך עשיך. And to prove that עשיך cannot ſignify *thy maker*, in the ſingular number, it is alſo found connected with the word *Jehovah* in its ſingular form, without the ' inſerted; as in *Iſai.* li. 13. *And forgetteſt the Lord* thy maker—יהוה עשך.

Eccl. xii. 1. *Remember* thy Creator *in the days of thy youth*, &c. The Hebrew of which is—*Remember* בוראיך את *thy Creators*, in the plural. And there is nothing ſtrange in this, when we can prove ſo eaſily that the world and all men in it were created by a *Trinity*.

Inſtead of the uſual names of God, *adjectives* expreſſing ſome divine attribute are very frequently ſubſtituted: and theſe alſo occur in the plural, as in the following examples.

Prov. ix. 10. *The fear of the Lord is the beginning of wiſdom, and the knowledge* (קדשים) *of the* HOLY ONES *is underſtanding.* Another inſtance of which may be found in Chap. xxx. 3. ſee alſo *Hoſea* xi. 12. in the *Hebrew*, xii. 1.

Eccl. v. 8. *There be* HIGHER *than they.* The Hebrew is (גבהים) *high ones*, in the plural: and is underſtood even by the *Jews* themſelves to mean the *holy and bleſſed God. Junius* and *Tremellius* put *altiſſimus* in their text, but acknowledge the Hebrew to be *alti—plurale pro ſingulari ſuperlativo; myſterium* S. Triados *notans.*

Pſalm lxxviii. 25. *Man did eat* Angels *food.*

The word (אבירים) *mighty* ones, is never uſed for *Angels*; and muſt in this place ſignify *God*, for the two following reaſons: 1. Becauſe *Abir* in the ſingular is ſeveral times

uſed abſolutely as a name of God; who is called *Abir Iſrael*, the *mighty one of Iſrael*, and *Abir Jacob*, *the mighty one of Jacob*. *Gen.* xlix. 24. *Pſal.* cxxxii. 2. where the LXX. have rendered it Θεος. 2. Becauſe our bleſſed Saviour, in diſcourſing upon the *Manna*, *John* vi. 31—33, quotes this part of the Pſalm, and calls that *the bread of God from heaven*, which in the Pſalm itſelf is called the *bread of the* mighty. Therefore *Abirim* is put for *Elohim*, and is taken in the *plural* becauſe God is plural.

IX.

Dan. iv. 26. And whereas THEY *commanded* to leave the ſtump of the tree-roots, &c.

At the 13th verſe of this Chapter we read only of one *watcher* or *holy one* coming down from heaven, of whom it is ſaid that HE *cried—leave the ſtump of his roots in the earth.* Yet the number is here very remarkably changed from *he ſaid* to *they commanded.* And though the words of the curſe upon *Nebuchadnezzar* were pronounced by A *watcher* and An *holy one*, in the ſingular; nevertheleſs, at the cloſe of the ſpeech, this *matter* is declared to be by the *decree of the* WATCHERS *and the demand by the word of the* HOLY ONES [1]. Now it is very certain that the judgments of God are not founded upon the *decree* and *word* of Angels, or of any created beings: therefore this *watcher* could be no created angel, but a perſon in the Lord *Jehovah*, who condeſcends to *watch over* [2] his people, and is called the *keeper of Iſrael, that neither ſlumbereth nor ſleepeth.* The change of theſe verbs and nouns from the ſingular to the plural, can be accounted for upon no other principle: it is a caſe to which there is no parallel in any language, and ſuch as can be reconcileable only to the Being of *God*, who is *one* and *many*. We are to collect from it, that in this, as in every act of the Godhead, there was a conſent and concurrence of the perſons in the Trinity; and though there was *one*

[1] Ver. 17. Compare this with Prov. ix. 10. cited in No. VIII. of this chapter. [2] Jer. xxxi. 28.

only who *ſpake*, it was the *word* and *decree* of *all*. There is an inſtance of this ſort in the New-Teſtament. The Diſciples of *Chriſt* were commanded to *baptize in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghoſt*. And, without doubt, the baptiſm they adminiſtered was in all caſes agreeable to the preſcribed form. Nevertheleſs we are told of ſome, who were commanded to be *baptized in the name of the Lord*[1], and particularly, in the *name of the Lord Jeſus*[2]: ſo that there was a ſtrange defect either in the baptiſm itſelf, or in the account we have of it; or the mention of one perſon in the Trinity muſt *imply* the preſence, name, and authority of them all; as the paſſage is underſtood by Irenæus—*in Chriſti nomine ſubauditur qui unxit, & qui unctus eſt, & ipſa unctio in qua unctus eſt. Lib.* III. *cap.* 20.

X.

Dan. v. 18. The moſt high GOD *gave* to *Nebuchadnezzar* a kingdom and majeſty and *glory* and honour.

Ver. 20. And THEY took his *glory* from him.

Here again, the word *they* is a plain relative to the *moſt high God*. Nor can it otherwiſe be agreeable to the ſenſe of the hiſtory, or the reaſon of the thing itſelf, conſidered as a matter of fact. For who was it that *took away* the *glory* of the king? It was not the work of *men*, but a ſupernatural act of *the moſt high God*; to whom *Nebuchadnezzar* himſelf hath aſcribed it—*thoſe that walk in pride* HE *is able to* abaſe.

I might here ſubjoin in proof of a *plurality*, thoſe numerous paſſages of the Old Teſtament, wherein God is ſpoken of, or ſpeaks of himſelf, as of *more perſons than one*. I will produce a few of them, to ſhew that ſuch are not wanting. *Gen.* xix. 24. *The* Lord *rained upon Sodom and upon Gomorrah brimſtone and fire* from the Lord *out of heaven*. *Pſal.* cx. 1. *The* Lord *ſaid unto* my Lord, *ſit thou on my right hand*, &c.

[1] Acts x. 48. [2] Ibid. viii. 16.

Dan. ix. 17. *Now therefore,* O our God, *hear the prayer of thy ſervant—for* the Lord's *ſake. Prov.* xxx. 4. *Who hath eſtabliſhed all the ends of the earth? What is* his *name, and what is his* Son's *name, if thou canſt tell? Iſai.* x. 12. *When the* Lord *hath performed* his *whole work upon Jeruſalem I will puniſh,* &c. *Ibid.* xiii. 13. *I will ſhake the heavens, and the earth ſhall remove out of her place, in the wrath of the* Lord of Hoſts, *and in the day of* his *fierce anger. Ibid.* xxii. 19. *And* I will *drive thee from thy ſtation, and from thy ſtate ſhall* he *pull thee down. Ibid.* lxiv. 4. *Neither hath the eye ſeen,* O God, *beſide* thee, *what he hath prepared for him that waiteth for* him. *Hoſ.* i. 7. *I will have mercy upon the houſe of Judah, and will ſave them by the* Lord their God. *Zech.* ii. 10—11. *I will dwell in the midſt of thee, ſaith* the Lord; *and many nations ſhall be joined to* the Lord *in that day and ſhall be* my *people*; *and I will dwell in the midſt of thee, and thou ſhalt know that* the Lord of Hoſts *hath ſent* me *unto thee. Ibid.* x. 12. *And I will ſtrengthen them in the* Lord, *and they ſhall walk up and down in* his *name, ſaith* the Lord.

The Paſſages hitherto produced in this Chapter are deſigned only to prove an *indefinite* plurality in God. In the remaining part of it, I ſhall bring forward another claſs of texts, which ſhews this plurality to be a *Trinity*.

XI.

Pſal. xxxiii. 6. By the WORD of the LORD were the heavens made, and all the hoſt of them by the *breath* (*Heb.* SPIRIT) of his mouth.

The *breath* or ſpirit of the Lord's *mouth*, does undoubtedly mean the third perſon of the Trinity; who is called, *Job* xxxiii. 4. *The* Spirit *of God, and the* Breath *of the Almighty*. And it ſhould here be remembered, that when Chriſt communicated the *Holy Ghoſt* to his diſciples, he did it by *breathing* upon them [1]: a demonſtration that *Chriſt* our Saviour, who, as a *perſon*, is the *word* of the Lord, is in *nature* the Lord *himſelf*; becauſe the ſpirit or *breath* of the *Almighty*

[1] John xx. 22.

is alſo the *breath* of *Chriſt*. And this fact is alſo deciſive for the word FILIOQUE, ſo much controverted in the *Nicene* Creed.

XII.

Iſai. xlviii. 16. And now the LORD GOD and his SPIRIT hath ſent ME.

The ſpeaker in this verſe is no other than *Chriſt*, who at ver. 12. calls himſelf *the firſt and the laſt*, and does here declare himſelf to be *ſent*, not only by the *Lord God*, but alſo by his *Spirit:* which ſhould be taken ſome notice of, becauſe the *Arians* have objected to the co-equality of the *Son* with the *Father*, becauſe he is ſaid to be *ſent* by him. But if this ſhould hold, it will follow that *Chriſt*, for the ſame reaſon, is alſo inferior to the *Spirit*. The author of an *Eſſay on Spirit*, whoſe violent proceedings in the Church have chiefly moved me to draw up theſe papers, is warm in the purſuit of this argument, that *Chriſt* is inferior to the Father, becauſe he was *ſent* by him. "We may therefore, "ſays he, fairly argue, as our Saviour himſelf does upon "another occaſion—that as *the ſervant is not* equal *to his* "*Lord, ſo neither is he that is ſent* equal *to him that ſent* "*him* [1]." Not quite ſo *fairly:* for here is a groſs miſrepreſentation, of which, and of many other things, this author ſhould give us ſome account, before he proceeds any farther in the work of *reformation*; it being a maxim, I think, with the wiſe and learned, that a man ſhould always reform *himſelf*, before he undertakes to reform the world. Upon the occaſion he refers to, our Saviour has ſaid—*The Servant is* NOT GREATER *than his Lord*; *neither is he that is ſent* GREATER *than he that ſent him* [2]. But in the place of this, he has ventured to ſubſtitute another reading that comes up to his point, and agrees better with the intended work of Reformation—"*he that is ſent is* not equal *to him* "*that ſent him*;" printing the word *equal* in a different character to make it the more obſervable; and then puts an

[1] P. 98. [2] John xiii. 16.

objection of his own *forging* into the mouth of our bleſſed Saviour. He profeſſes himſelf a great enemy to *human compoſitions:* and we have reaſon to believe him, where thoſe compoſitions are not *his own.* But his making ſo free with this and many other texts, does not look as if he was any great friend to the compoſitions of the *Holy Ghoſt*; and can do but little credit to a *Vindicator* of the *Holy Scriptures* from the cavils and ſcoffs of an Infidel.

XIII.

Iſai. xxxiv. 16. Seek ye out of the Book of the *Lord* and read—for MY mouth it hath commanded, and HIS SPIRIT it hath gathered them.

In theſe words, there is *one* perſon ſpeaking of the *Spirit* of *another* perſon: ſo that the whole *Trinity* is here included. Whether God *the Father* or God *the Son* is to be underſtood as the ſpeaker, it is neither eaſy nor material to determine. I am rather inclined to think it is the *former.*

XIV.

Numb. vi. 24, &c.

The LORD bleſs thee and keep thee.

The LORD make his face to ſhine upon thee, and be gracious unto thee.

The LORD lift up his countenance upon thee, and give thee peace.

After this form the High Prieſt was commanded to bleſs the children of Iſrael. The name of *the Lord,* in Hebrew *Jehovah,* is here repeated *three* times. And parallel to this is the form of Chriſtian Baptiſm; wherein the three perſonal terms of *Father, Son,* and *Holy Ghoſt,* are not repreſented as ſo many different names, but as one *name:* the one divine nature of God being no more divided by theſe three, than by the ſingle name *Jehovah* thrice repeated. If the three articles of this benediction be attentively conſidered, their contents will be found to agree reſpectively to the three perſons

perſons taken in the uſual order of *the Father*, *the Son*, and *the Holy Ghoſt*. The *Father* is the author of *bleſſing* and *preſervation*. Grace and *illumination* are from the *Son*, by whom we have *the* light *of the knowledge of the* glory *of God*, *in the* face *of Jeſus Chriſt*. *Peace* is the gift of the *Spirit*, whoſe name is *the Comforter*, and whoſe firſt and beſt *fruit* is the work of *Peace*.

Petrus Alphonſi, an eminent *Jew*, converted in the beginning of the 12th Century, and preſented to the font by *Alphonſus* a king of *Spain*, wrote a learned treatiſe againſt the *Jews*, wherein he preſſes them with this Scripture, as a plain argument that there are *three perſons* to whom the great and *incommunicable* name of *Jehovah* is applied. And even the unconverted *Jews*, according to *Bechai*, one of their *Rabbies*, have a tradition, that when the high Prieſt pronounced this Bleſſing over the people—*elevatione manuum ſic digitos compoſuit*, *ut* Triada *exprimerent—he lifted up his hands*, *and diſpoſed his fingers into ſuch a form as to expreſs a* Trinity. All the foundation there is for this in the Scripture, is *Lev.* ix. 22. As for the reſt, be it a matter of fact or not, yet if we conſider whence it comes, there is ſomething very remarkable in it. See *Obſerv. Joſ. de voiſ.* in *Pug. Fid. p.* 400, 556, 557.

XV.

Matt. xxviii. 19. Baptizing them in the name of the FATHER, and of the SON, and of the HOLY GHOST.

XVI.

2 *Theſ.* iii. 5. The LORD (the *Holy-Ghoſt*, ſee c. 2. art. 4. 18.) direct your hearts into the love of GOD (*the Father*) and into the patient waiting for CHRIST.

XVII.

2 *Cor.* xiii. 14. The grace of our LORD JESUS CHRIST, and the love of GOD, and the communion of the HOLY GHOST.

In this and the foregoing article, the *order* of the *perſons* is different from that of *Matth.* xxviii. 19. The Holy Ghoſt having the *firſt place* in the former of them, and Chriſt in the latter: which is a ſufficient warrant for that clauſe in the Creed of St. *Athanaſius*—"In this Trinity, none is "afore or after other." And Dr. *Clarke*, I preſume, apprehended ſomething of this ſort; becauſe he has corrected the Apoſtle, and tranſpoſed the order of the perſons in 2 *Cor.* xiii. 14. without the leaſt apology, or giving his reader any warning of it. §. LV. p. 377.

XVIII.

1 *John* v. 7. There are THREE that bear record in heaven, the FATHER, the WORD, and the HOLY GHOST—

There has been much diſputing about the authenticity of this Text. I firmly believe it to be genuine for the following reaſons: 1. St. *Jerom* [1], who had a better opportunity of examining the true merits of the cauſe than we can poſſibly have at this diſtance of time, tells us plainly, that he found out how it had been adulterated, miſtranſlated, and omitted on purpoſe to elude the truth. 2. The Divines of *Lovain* having compared many *Latin* copies, found this text wanting but in five of them; and *R. Stephens* found it retained in nine of ſixteen ancient manuſcripts which he uſed. 3. It is *certainly* quoted twice by St. *Cyprian* [2], who wrote before the council of *Nice:* and alſo by *Tertullian*; as the reader is left to judge after he has read the Paſſage in the Margin [3]. Dr. *Clarke*, therefore, is *not to be believed* when he tells us, it was "never cited by any of the *Latins* before St. *Jerom* [4]." 4. The ſenſe is not perfect without it; there being a contraſt of three witneſſes in heaven to three upon earth; the *Father*, the *Word*, *and* the *Holy Ghoſt*, whoſe

[1] Præf. ad Canon. Epiſt. [2] De Unit. Eccl. 109. Epiſt. LXXIII.

[3] Connexus patris in filio, & filii in paracleto, tres efficit cohærentes, alterum ex altero; *qui tres unum ſunt*, &c. *adv.* Prax.

[4] See the text in his 2d Edition.

teſtimony

teſtimony is called the *witneſs of God*; and the *Spirit*, the *water*, and the *blood*, which being adminiſtered by the Church upon earth, is called the *witneſs of men*. He that deſires to ſee this text farther vindicated from the malice of *Fauſtus Socinus*, may conſult *Pool*'s *Synopſis*, and Dr. *Hammond*; and I wiſh he would alſo read what has lately been publiſhed upon it by my good and learned friend Dr. *Delany*, in his volume of Sermons, p. 69, &c.

But even allowing it to be ſpurious, it contains nothing but what is abundantly aſſerted elſewhere; and that both with regard to the Trinity in general, and this their divine *Teſtimony* in particular. For that there are *three* divine perſons who *bear record* to the Miſſion of Chriſt, is evident from the following Scriptures:

John viii. 17, 18. *The Teſtimony of two men is true.*
I am ONE *that bear witneſs of* MYSELF.
The FATHER *that ſent me beareth witneſs of me.*

1 *John* v. 6. *It is the* SPIRIT *that beareth witneſs.* And Chriſt has alſo mentioned, upon another occaſion, a *plurality* of witneſſes in heaven,—WE *ſpeak* (ſays he) *that* we *do know, and teſtify that* we *have* ſeen, *and ye receive not* OUR *Witneſs*[1]! which can be no other than the *witneſs* of the *Trinity*; becauſe it is added—*no man hath aſcended up to heaven, but he that came down from heaven*; therefore no *man* could join with *Chriſt* in revealing the things of heaven to us.

XIX.

Iſa. vi. 3. And one cried unto another and ſaid, HOLY, HOLY, HOLY is the LORD OF HOSTS. See alſo *Rev.* iv. 8.

"They are not content (ſays *Origen*) to ſay it *once* or "*twice*, but take the perfect number of the *Trinity*, thereby "to declare the manifold *holineſs* of God; which is a re- "peated intercommunion of a threefold holineſs; the holi- "neſs of the *Father*, the holineſs of the only begotten *Son*,

[1] John iii. 11.

and

" and of the *Holy Ghoſt* [1]." And that the *Seraphim* did really celebrate all the three perſons of the Godhead upon this occaſion, is no conjecture; but a point capable of the cleareſt demonſtration.

The prophet tells us, ver. 1. *he ſaw the* Lord *ſitting upon a throne*; and at ver. 5. that *his eyes had ſeen the king, the Lord of Hoſts*. Now if there be any phraſe in the Bible to diſtinguiſh the true God, it is this of the *Lord of Hoſts*. I never ſaw it diſputed by any *Arian* writer. The author of an *Eſſay on Spirit* confeſſes it [2]; and Dr. *Clarke* ſuppoſes the name *Lord of Sabaoth* (Jam. v. 4.) proper to the *Father* only. So that in this *Lord of Hoſts*, ſitting upon his Throne, there was the preſence of *God the Father*.

That there was alſo the preſence of *God the Son*, appears from *John* xii. 41. *Theſe things ſaid* Eſaias, *when he ſaw his* (Chriſt's) *Glory, and ſpake of him* *.

And that there was the preſence of *God the Holy Ghoſt*, is determined by *Acts* xxviii. 25. *Well ſpake the* Holy Ghoſt *by Eſaias the Prophet unto our Fathers, ſaying*, &c. then follow

[1] Non eis ſufficet ſemel clamare ſanctus, neque bis; ſed perfectum numerum Trinitatis aſſumunt, ut multitudinem ſanctitatis Dei manifeſtent; quæ eſt trinæ ſanctitatis repetita communitas; ſanctitas patris, ſanctitas unigeniti filii, & ſpiritus ſancti. *Orig. Hom. in loc.*

[2] P. 65.

* It is written at ver. 3.—*Holy, holy, holy is the* Lord of Hoſts, *the whole earth is full of* HIS GLORY. This St. *John* has affirmed to be the *Glory of Chriſt*; but it was the glory of the Lord of Hoſts: therefore Chriſt is the Lord of Hoſts. And if the parallel paſſage of *Rev.* iv. 8. be compared with this, it will appear (as it hath already Chap. I. Art. XXIII.) that he is the *God Almighty* ſpoken of in that Book. The Greek verſion of the LXX. hath it thus:

αγιος, αγιος, αγιος Κυριος σαβαωθ.

In *Rev.* iv. 8. it is, αγιος, αγιος, αγιος Κυριος ο Θεος ο παντοκρατωρ. Whence it evidently appears, that Κυριος ο Θεος ο παντοκρατωρ, is equivalent in the language of heaven to *Jehovah Sabaoth*: therefore, as *Chriſt* is the *Lord of Hoſts* of the Old Teſtament, he is thereby proved *ipſo facto* to be the *God Almighty* of the New. Which ſhews the weakneſs of thoſe frequent remarks Dr. *Clarke* has beſtowed upon the word παντοκρατωρ, as the great term of diſtinction between the perſon of *Chriſt*, and that of God *the Father*.

the

the words which the prophet affirms to have been ſpoken by the *Lord of Hoſts*.

The text of *John* xii. 41. which being compared with this of *Iſaiah*, proves the ſecond perſon of the Trinity to be the *Lord of Hoſts*, is evaded by Dr. *Clarke* in the following manner: "The *Glory* which *Iſaias* ſaw, *Iſai.* vi. 1. is plainly "the glory of *God the Father*; whence the followers of "*Sabellius* conclude, becauſe St. *John* here calls it the *Glory* "*of Chriſt*, that therefore the Father and the Son are one "and the ſame individual perſon [1]." It is concluded by the Orthodox of the Church of *England*, that the perſon of Chriſt, and the perſon of God the Father, are not one and the ſame *individual perſon*, but one and the ſame *Lord of Hoſts*; becauſe the Scripture, thus compared, hath affirmed them ſo to be; and THIS is the *concluſion* Dr. *Clarke* ſhould have anſwered. But inſtead of *this*, he has produced the monſtrous and impoſſible doctrine of *Sabellius*, that they are one and the ſame *individual perſon*, and anſwered *that*: which to be ſure is eaſily done, and is quite foreign to the purpoſe. The other concluſion, which is the only true and natural one, is kept out of ſight, becauſe it cannot be anſwered: and this of *Sabellius* is ſlurred upon his credulous Readers, as the doctrine of the *orthodox*, who diſclaim and ahhor it. This is no ſlander; for let any perſon read his book with a little circumſpection, and he will ſoon find who and what he would mean by the *followers* and *doctrine* of *Sabellius*. And let me give the reader the following caution, which he will find to be of great ſervice in detecting the fallacious anſwers of the *Arian* writers in their controverſies with the orthodox. Always be careful to examine whether they have replied to the proof *itſelf*, or to *ſomething elſe* in the place of it. For when you have obtained any clear evidence from the Scripture, that two or more perſons are one *God*, one *Lord*, &c. they will give a new face to your concluſion, by changing the terms *God* or *Lord*, which are names of a *nature*, for that of *perſon*, which can belong only to an

[1] P. 102.

individual.

individual. And then they ſhout for victory. O, ſay they, this man is a *Sabellian!* he believes *three perſons* to be *one perſon!* But on the other hand, if you make it appear that in the Unity of the one God or Lord there are more perſons than one, then they change the word *perſons* for that of *Gods:* ſo that you are confuted this way alſo; and they cry you up for a *Tritheiſt, a* maintainer of *three Gods!* By the help of this artifice, Dr. *Clarke* attempted to deal with the *Scripture*; and the Author of an *Eſſay on Spirit* with the *Creeds* and *Liturgy* of the Church. And, though it be a matter ſcarce worth mentioning, thus alſo the Authors of a *Monthly Review* have attempted to deal with *myſelf.* Some time ago I publiſhed a *full Anſwer to the Eſſay on Spirit,* which has ſince been reprinted in *Ireland,* and I humbly hope may have done ſome little ſervice. But when theſe Gentlemen had deliberated with themſelves upon it for three or four months, it was retailed from their ſcandalous Shop as a ſyſtem of *Tritheiſm, Sabellianiſm,* and what not? I hope God will forgive them! and this is all the anſwer I ſhall ever make to ſuch men and ſuch writers.

CHAP.

CHAP. IV.

THE TRINITY IN UNITY.

IF there be any diverſity of nature, or any eſſential ſubordination in the perſons of the Godhead, it muſt be revealed to us either in their *names*, or their *attributes*, or their *Acts*; for it is by theſe only that they are or can poſſibly be made known to us in this Life. If the Scripture has made no difference in any of theſe, farther than that of a *perſonal* diſtinction, (which we all allow) we are no longer to doubt that there is a natural or eſſential *Unity* in the three Perſons of the *Father*, the *Word*, and the *Holy Ghoſt*. It ſhall therefore be ſhewn in this Chapter, by a ſort of proof more comprehenſive than what has gone before, that theſe Perſons have the ſame *Names*, the ſame *attributes*, the ſame counſel or *will*, and all concur, after an ineffable manner, in the ſame divine *Acts*: ſo that what the Scripture is falſely ſuppoſed to have aſcribed to God in *one* Perſon, will appear to be aſcribed by the ſame authority to God in *three* perſons. That therefore, theſe three perſons are but *one God*; they are three diſtinct *agents*, yet there is but one and the ſame divine *agency*: or, as the Church has more fully and better expreſſed it, that "that which we believe of the glory of "the Father, the ſame we are to believe of the Son, and "of the Holy Ghoſt, without any difference or inequa-"lity [1]."

I.

The Trinity in Unity is the *one Lord*, the *Creator* of the world.

[1] Proper Preface upon the feaſt of Trinity.

Pſal.

Pſal. xxxiii. 6. *By the* Word *of the* Lord *were the heavens made, and all the hoſt of them by the* breath (*Heb.* Spirit) *of his mouth.* The whole Trinity therefore created the world: yet this Trinity is but *one Lord:* for it is written,

Iſai. xliv. 24. *I am the* Lord *that maketh all things, that ſtretcheth forth the heavens* ALONE, *that ſpreadeth abroad the earth* BY MYSELF. It follows therefore, either that the *word* and *ſpirit* did *not* make the heavens, or, that the *Father,* with his *word* and *ſpirit,* are the ALONE Lord and Creator of all things.

II.

The Trinity in Unity is the one Supreme Being or Nature, diſtinguiſhed from all other Beings by the Name *Jehovah.* For the Scripture gives us the following poſition.

Deut. vi. 4. *The Lord our God is* ONE JEHOVAH: and again, *Pſal.* lxxxiii. *Thou whoſe name* ALONE *is* JEHOVAH, *art the moſt high over all the earth.*

Yet *Chriſt* is *Jehovah.*

Jer. xxiii. 3. *This is the name whereby* he *ſhall be called,* JEHOVAH *our righteouſneſs.*

So is the *Spirit* alſo.

Ezek. viii. i. 3. *The Lord* JEHOVAH *put forth the form of an hand, and took me,*——*and the* SPIRIT *lift me,* &c. ſee alſo CHAP. II. Art. IV. and XXIV.

Therefore, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghoſt are the ONE Jehovah: they are three perſons, yet have but *one name,* and *one nature.* And it is the great advantage of this argument, that the Name *Jehovah* is not capable of any ſuch equivocal interpretations as that of *God*; it has no plural; is incommunicable to any derived or created being; and is peculiar to the divine nature, becauſe it is deſcriptive of it. The Author of an *Eſſay on Spirit* has endeavoured to avoid the force of this proof, by pretending that there are *two Jehovahs,* one a diſtinct Being from the other. But in this he has expoſed the cauſe he meant to defend, and left the argument in a worſe ſtate than he found it: for if there be *two,* then it is falſe that there is a *moſt high over all the earth,*

whoſe

whoſe name ALONE *is Jehovah*; and let him try if he can reconcile it. Dr. *Clarke* alſo pretends, in the Titles to two of his Sections, wherein the collection of texts is very numerous, to have ſet down the *Paſſages wherein it is declared* that the Second and Third perſons *derive their Being* (that is the expreſſion he was not afraid to make uſe of) *from the Father*. But he has not produced one ſuch paſſage; no ſuch thing being declared in the whole Bible; and the contrary to it is plainly revealed under this application of the name *Jehovah*.

III.

The Trinity in Unity is *the Lord* abſolutely ſo called; in *Hebrew*, *Adonai*; in *Greek*, ο Κυριος.

Rom. x. 12. † *The ſame* LORD *over all, is rich unto all that call upon him.*

Luke ii. 11. *A Saviour which is Chriſt the* LORD.

Rom. xi. 34. *For who hath known the mind of the* LORD, *or who hath been his counſellor?* Which *Lord*, as we learn from the prophet whence this is quoted, is the *Spirit*; for it is written, *Iſai.* xl. 13. *who hath directed the* SPIRIT *of the Lord, or being his counſellor hath taught him?* That the perſon of the *Spirit* is the *Lord*, is alſo plain from 2 *Cor.* iii. 18. *now the Lord is that Spirit*—ο δε κυριος το Πνευμα εστιν—*we are changed from glory to glory as by the Spirit of the Lord*; καθαπερ απο κυριου Πνευματος, *as by the Lord the Spirit:* which is all along to be underſtood of the *perſonal Spirit*, becauſe the Apoſtle begins expreſsly with *that* at the 3d verſe of this chapter. And it was from the authority of theſe words—*The Lord is the Spirit*—added to thoſe of ver. 6. *the Spirit giveth life*—that the council of *Nice* borrowed the following clauſe of its Creed—"*I believe in the Holy Ghoſt, the* LORD *and* GIVER OF LIFE."

† The Reader is deſired to obſerve, that as I cannot in all caſes fix upon a text that does preciſely diſtinguiſh the *perſon* of the *Father*, I ſhall therefore be frequently obliged, as in this inſtance, to ſet a paſſage down in *the firſt* of the three ranks, that does confeſſedly denote the *true God*.

IV.

IV.

The Trinity in Unity is the *God of Iſrael.*

Matth. xv. 31. *The multitude glorified the* God of Iſrael.

Luke i. 16, 17. *The children of* Iſrael *ſhall he turn to the Lord* THEIR GOD: *and he ſhall go before* HIM *—that is, before *Chriſt.*

2 *Sam.* xxiii. 2, 3. *The* SPIRIT *of the Lord* ſpake *by me—the* GOD *of* Iſrael ſaid, &c. So that unleſs he who *ſpake* was *one* being, and he that *ſaid* was *another*, the *Spirit* is the *God of Iſrael.*

* Dr. *Clarke* allows that the word *him* means *Chriſt*, yet denies that he is intended by *the Lord their God*, which is the *antecedent* to it: and calls this a *manner of ſpeaking*[1].

V.

The divine *Law*, and conſequently the *authority* whereupon it is founded, is that of a Trinity in Unity.

Rom. vii. 25. *I myſelf ſerve the* LAW *of* GOD.

Gal. vi. 2. *Fulfil the* LAW *of* CHRIST *.

Rom. viii. 2. *The* LAW *of the* SPIRIT *of life* *.

The divine *Law* then, is the law of *God*, *Chriſt*, and the *Spirit of life*. But it is written, *Jam.* iv. 12. *There is* ONE LAWGIVER *who is able to ſave and to deſtroy*: therefore, *theſe* THREE *are* ONE. And here we have the true reaſon why the Scripture has repreſented the whole Trinity as *tempted* and *reſiſted* by the *diſobedience* of man. For *ſin* being the tranſgreſſion of the *Law*, and the law being derived from the undivided authority of the *Father*, the *Son*, and the *Holy Ghoſt*, every breach of it is an offence againſt the Trinity: therefore it is written,

Deut. vi. 16. *Thou ſhalt not* TEMPT *the* LORD *thy God.*

1 *Cor.* x. 9.—*neither let us* TEMPT CHRIST.

Acts v. 9. *How is it that ye have agreed together to* TEMPT *the* SPIRIT *of the Lord?* For Dr. *Clarke*'s opinion of this matter, ſee Ch. II. Art. XV.

[1] No. 354.

** Dr.

** Dr. *Clarke* has left both theſe texts out of his collection; though he pretends to have ſet down all the *higheſt Expreſſions* relating to *Chriſt* and the *Spirit*.

VI.

The *mind* and *will* of God is the mind and will of a Trinity in Unity.

The *mind* of God.

1 *Cor.* ii. 16. *Who hath known the* MIND *of the* LORD?
Ibid.—*We have the* MIND *of* CHRIST.

Rom. viii. 27. *He that ſearcheth the hearts, knoweth what is the* MIND *of the* SPIRIT.

The *will* of God.

1 *Theſſ.* iv. 3. *This is the* WILL *of* GOD.

Acts xxii. 14. *The God of our Fathers hath choſen thee, that thou ſhouldſt know* HIS WILL*.

2 *Pet.* i. 21. *Prophecy came not in old time by the* WILL *of man; but holy men of God ſpake as they were moved by the* HOLY GHOST.

* This paſſage is meant of *Chriſt*, and of *his* will. *The God of our fathers* (ſaid *Ananias*) *hath* CHOSEN *thee*, &c. but the *perſon* in God who appeared to *Ananias*, and ſaid of *Saul, he is a* CHOSEN *veſſel unto* ME, was *the Lord, even Jeſus. Acts* ix. 15, 17. For want of comparing the Scripture with itſelf, Dr. *Clarke* has ſet down the text of *Acts* xxii. 14. as a character of the *Father only*. No. 366.

VII.

The *Power* of God is the Power of a Trinity in Unity.

Eph. iii. 7.—*The grace of* GOD *given unto me, by the effectual working of* HIS POWER.

2 *Cor.* xii. 9.—*that the* POWER *of* CHRIST *may reſt upon me.*

Rom. xv. 19.—*ſigns and wonders by the* POWER *of the* SPIRIT *of God.*

The Scripture therefore has aſcribed divine *power*, and that in the ſame exerciſe of it (the *miniſtry* and *miracles* of St. *Paul*) to *Chriſt* and the *Spirit* in common with God *the*

Father. So that when all glory and *power* is aſcribed to the *only wiſe God*, what God can that be, but the Trinity? Upon this principle the Scripture is eaſily reconciled: upon any other it is unintelligible, as the reader may ſoon find by conſulting Dr. *Clarke*, and ſome other of the *Arian* writers; who to avoid this plain doctrine, have tried to amuſe us with a religion made up of ſcholaſtic niceties and unnatural diſtinctions, which no man can underſtand, and which themſelves are not agreed in, nor ever will be to the world's end. Yet they often diſpute againſt us from the acknowledged *ſimplicity* of the Scripture!

VIII.

The Trinity in Unity is *Eternal.*

Rom. xvi. 25, 26. *The myſtery—made manifeſt according to the commandment* (αιωνιου) *of the* EVERLASTING GOD.

Rev. xxii. 13. *I* (*Jeſus*) *am the* FIRST *and the* LAST *.

Heb. ix. 14.—*who through* (αιωνιου) *the* EVERLASTING SPIRIT.

* Dr. *Clarke* allows theſe words, in *this place*, to mean *Chriſt*; yet where the ſame words occur in *Rev.* i. 8. with the addition of the epithet *Almighty*, he denies it [1]; though they are demonſtrated to be ſpoken of the ſame perſon by the context and tenour of the whole chapter †: and he tells us, the character in one place *differs* from the other. So that upon his principle, the Scripture has revealed to us two different beings, both of whom are the *firſt and the laſt*, yet not *coeternal.* Which is ſufficient of itſelf to juſtify all that was ſaid above concerning his *diſtinctions*, &c. See Ch. I. Art. III.

IX.

——Is TRUE.

John vii. 28. *He that ſent me is* TRUE.

Rev. iii. 7. *Theſe things ſaith he—that is* TRUE, *he that hath the key of David*, &c.

[1] See No. 686. 414. † See the *note* at Ch. III. Art. XIX.

1 *John* v. 6. *It is the Spirit that beareth witneſs, becauſe the* SPIRIT *is* TRUTH—η αληθεια THE truth.

X.

——is *Holy.*

Rev. xv. 4. *Who ſhall not fear thee, O* LORD, *and glorify thy name? for* THOU ONLY *art* HOLY.

Acts iii. 14. *But ye denied* THE HOLY ONE, *and deſired a murderer to be releaſed unto you,* &c. See alſo *Dan.* ix. 24. and *Rev.* iii. 7.

1 *John* ii. 20. *Ye have an unction from* THE HOLY ONE; that is, an *anointing* from the *Holy Ghoſt*, who is called

John xiv. 26. TO πνευμα TO αγιον, *The Spirit the Holy one.*

XI.

——is *omnipreſent.*

Jer. xxiii. 24. *Do not I* fill heaven and earth, *ſaith the* LORD?

Eph. i. 22.—*the fulneſs of* HIM (Chriſt) *that* filleth all in all.

Pſal. cxxxix. 7, 8. *Whither ſhall I go then from thy* SPIRIT?—*if I go up into* heaven THOU *art* there; *if I go down into* hell, THOU *art* there *alſo.*

XII.

——is the fountain of *life.*

Deut. xxx. 20.—*love the* LORD *thy* GOD, *for* HE *is* thy LIFE.

Col. iii. 4. *When* CHRIST *who is* OUR LIFE *ſhall appear,* &c.

Rom. viii. 10. *The* SPIRIT *is* LIFE.

XIII.

The Trinity in Unity *made* all mankind.

Pſal. c. 3. *The* LORD *he is* GOD, *it is* HE *that hath* MADE US.

John i. 3. *By* HIM (Chriſt) *were* ALL THINGS MADE.

Job xxxiii. 4. *The* SPIRIT *of God hath* MADE *me.*

XIV.

——*quicken the dead.*

John v. 21. *The* FATHER *raiſeth up the dead, and* QUICKENETH *them.*

Ibid.—even ſo the SON QUICKENETH *whom he will.*

Ibid. vi. 63. *It is the* SPIRIT *that* QUICKENETH.

XV.

——*inſtruct* us in divine knowledge.

John vi. 45. *They ſhall be all* TAUGHT *of* GOD.

Gal. i. 12. *Neither was I* TAUGHT *it but by the revelation of* JESUS CHRIST.

John xiv. 26. *The Comforter, the holy* SPIRIT, *will* TEACH *you all things.*

XVI.

——have *fellowſhip* with the faithful.

1 *John* i. 3. *Truly our* FELLOWSHIP *is with the* FATHER.—Gr. Κοινωνια.

Ibid. And with his Son JESUS CHRIST.

2 *Cor.* xiii. 14. *The* FELLOWSHIP (Κοινωνια) *of the* HOLY GHOST *be with you all.*

XVII.

——are ſpiritually *preſent in* the elect.

1 *Cor.* xiv. 25.—GOD *is* IN YOU *of a truth.*

2 *Cor.* xiii. 5. CHRIST *is* IN YOU, *except ye be reprobates.*

John xiv. 17. *The* SPIRIT—*dwelleth with you and ſhall be* IN YOU.

So again,

2 *Cor.* vi. 16. GOD *hath ſaid, I will* DWELL *in them.*

Epheſ. iii. 17. *That* CHRIST *may* DWELL *in your hearts.*

Rom. viii. 11, *His* SPIRIT *that* DWELLETH *in you.*

XVIII.

XVIII.

——*reveal* to us the Divine Will.

Phil. iii. 15. God *ſhall* REVEAL *even this unto you.*

Gal. i. 12.—*neither was I taught it but by the* REVELATION *of* JESUS CHRIST.

Luke ii. 26. *It was* REVEALED *unto him by the* HOLY GHOST.

So again,

Heb. i. 1. GOD *who* SPAKE *unto the fathers by the prophets.*

2 *Cor.* xiii. 3. *Ye ſeek a proof of* CHRIST SPEAKING *in me.*

Mark xiii. 11. *It is not ye that* SPEAK, *but the* HOLY GHOST.

And as prophecies are revealed *by*, ſo are they alſo delivered *in the name*, that is, by the ſpecial authority of each perſon in the Godhead. For though the uſual introduction to any divine revelation be—*Thus* SAITH *the* LORD—yet we alſo find the expreſſions—*Theſe things* SAITH *the* SON *of* GOD. *Rev.* ii. 18. And—*Thus* SAITH *the* HOLY GHOST. *Acts* xiii. 3. with many other paſſages to the ſame effect.

XIX.

——raiſed the Body of Chriſt from the grave.

1 *Cor.* vi. 14. GOD *hath both* RAISED UP *the* Lord, *and will alſo raiſe us up by his* OWN POWER *.

John ii. 19. *Deſtroy this temple, and in three days I* WILL RAISE IT UP.

1 *Pet.* iii. 18. *Chriſt—being put to death in the fleſh, but* QUICKENED *by the* SPIRIT.

* See Art. vii. of this Chapter.

XX.

——conduct the people of God.

Iſai. xlviii. 17. *I am the* LORD *thy* GOD, *which* LEADETH *thee by the way that thou ſhouldſt go.*

John x. 3. *He* (Chriſt the Shepherd) *calleth his own ſheep by name, and* LEADETH *them out.*

Rom. viii. 14. *As many as are* LED *by the* SPIRIT *of God, they are the ſons of God.*

XXI.

——give a commiſſion and authority to the miniſters of the Goſpel.

2 *Cor.* iii. 5, 6. *Our ſufficiency is of* GOD, *who hath* MADE *us able* MINISTERS.

1 *Tim.* i. 12. JESUS CHRIST—*counted me faithful,* PUTTING *me into the* MINISTRY.

Acts v. 28. *Take heed therefore—to all the flock over the which the* HOLY GHOST *hath* MADE *you* OVERSEERS.

XXII.

——*ſanctify* the elect.

Jude 1.—*to them that are* SANCTIFIED *by* GOD, *the* FATHER.

Heb. ii. 11. *He that* SANCTIFIETH, *and they who are ſanctified, are all of one; for which cauſe* he is not aſhamed to call them brethren.

Rom. xv. 16. *Being* SANCTIFIED *by the* HOLY GHOST.

XXIII.

——perform all ſpiritual and divine operations.

1 *Cor.* xii. 16. *It is the ſame* GOD *which* WORKETH ALL IN ALL.

Col. iii. 11. CHRIST *is all, and* IN ALL.

1 *Cor.* xii. 11. *But* ALL *theſe* WORKETH *that one and the ſelf-ſame* SPIRIT.

CONCLUSION.

LET us now take a review of what has been collected in theſe papers, and ſum up the evidence in its own natural terms.

It has appeared from the *firſt* Chapter, that *Chriſt Jeſus*, whoſe Divinity is daily blaſphemed amongſt us, becauſe it is not proved in the Scripture, is the *Lord of Hoſts* [1], the *firſt and the laſt* [2], than whom there is *no greater* [3], and beſide whom there is *no God* [4]: that he is the *Saviour of the world* [5], the *Lord* and *God* of the *holy Prophets* [6] and *Apoſtles* [7], the *moſt high God* [8], the *ſearcher of all hearts* [9], comprehended and made known to us under the name of *that God* to whom *the world was reconciled* [1]. Who though he was the *Word* of God, that *came forth* from the Father into the world; yet he *was God* [2], and of the ſame *divine nature* [3] with him that ſent him. Though he was perfect *man*, of the *ſeed* of *Abraham*, born of his mother, and in all things made like to his brethren; yet *the fulneſs of the Godhead dwelt in him bodily* [4]. Though he ſuffered, died [5], was pierced upon the Croſs, and redeemed us by his *blood*; yet that blood was the blood of *God* [6], and upon *his* Croſs *Jehovah* was *pierced* [7].

That the objections urged againſt all theſe poſitive proofs, proceed wholly upon falſe principles; being drawn, partly, from *natural religion* and *Philoſophy*, which never was, nor ever will be ſubject to the *law of God*; and is not intended ſo to be by thoſe who ſet it up and diſpute for it. Partly from the œconomical offices and humiliation of *Chriſt* in the *fleſh* [8]; in which it is nevertheleſs affirmed, that *God* himſelf was made *manifeſt* [9]. And laſtly, from the *unity* [1] of God ſo often aſſerted and inſiſted upon in the Scripture; not in

[1] Chap. I. Art. I. II. III. [2] III. [3] XLV. [4] III. [5] IV. [6] V. [7] XI. [8] IX. [9] XLIII. [1] XIV. [2] XIX. [3] XLIV. [4] XVIII. [5] XLVII. [6] XLIX. [7] XLIV. [8] XXV. XXVI. XXXIX. [9] 1 Tim. iii. 16. [1] XXIV. XXXIII.

oppoſition to the Godhead of Chriſt, but to the *Idols*[1] then worſhipped all over the heathen world. Hence it is, that God is called the *true God*; for they were *falſe* ones: *one God*; for they were *many*[2]: the *living God*[3]; for they were *vanities* without life. Yet in the place of theſe *idols*, who are to ſupply the contraſt, they have ſubſtituted the perſon of their bleſſed Redeemer, the *true God*[4], the *everlaſting Father*[5], the *Lord of Glory*[6], who is able to *ſubdue all things to himſelf*, and of whoſe *kingdom* there ſhall be *no end*.

From the *ſecond* Chapter it has appeared, that the *Holy Ghoſt* is our ſpiritual *Father*[7], by whoſe divine power we are *begotten* to a new life; and to whom we daily *pray* that he would not *lead us into temptation*[8]. That he is the *Lord*[9], even the *Lord of Hoſts*[1], the ruler of the Chriſtian œconomy, *calling* men to that *honour* in his church, which *God only*[2] can beſtow upon them. That he is incomprehenſibly *united* with *God*, and ſenſible of the omnipotent *will* in himſelf; *even as* the human *Spirit* is united to *man*, and underſtandeth its *own thoughts*[3]. That *his power* is the immediate power of *God himſelf*[4]; his *inſpiration*, is the inſpiration of *God*[5]; his *preſence*, the preſence of *God*[6]. That he *is God*[7], even the *higheſt*; for the *man* Chriſt Jeſus, who is the *Son of God*, and the *Son* of the *higheſt*, was *ſo called* BECAUSE he was begotten of the *Holy Ghoſt*[8].

That the objections uſually brought to diſguiſe and deſtroy this evidence, are taken from the *unity*, the *attributes* and *will* of God, and the *miniſtration* of the *Spirit* in the œconomy of grace; all of them falſely interpreted[9]. For as to the *unity* of God, it is not an unity of *perſon*. As to the ſupreme attribute of *goodneſs*, it is alſo poſſeſſed by the *Spirit*. As to the *Will* of God, according to which the gifts and graces of the Spirit are diſtributed, it is oppoſed to the will of *man*, not to that of the *Spirit*; which is ſaid to blow

[1] XXII. 1 John v. 21. [2] 1 Cor. viii. 5, 6. [3] Acts xiv. 15. [4] 1 John v. 20. [5] XX. [6] 1 Cor. ii. 8. [7] Ch. II. Art. I. [8] XI. [9] III. [1] XXII. [2] II. [3] XIII. [4] XVII. [5] VI. [6] IX. V. XX. [7] VIII. [8] XXI. [9] XXIII. XXIV.

where it liſteth, and to divide or diſtribute unto every man his gifts, not as *man* the receiver, but as he himſelf *willeth*[1].

It has appeared from the *third* Chapter, that God is ſignified to us throughout the Old Teſtament by a name that is plural[2], and proved to be ſuch from many particular inſtances; yet generally ſo reſtrained and qualified, as to deſtroy the ſuſpicion of a plurality of *Gods*. That to this common name of God, many other plural names and expreſſions are added[3]; and that an interchanging of the *plural* and *ſingular*[4] is frequently obſerved, which neither grammar nor reaſon can account for upon any principle, but that of a real divine plurality. That the *perſons* of God are *three* in number, preciſely diſtinguiſhed on ſome occaſions by the perſonal names of the *Father*, the *Word*, or *Son*, and the *Holy Spirit*[5], and alſo by different offices. That the ſame term is not always peculiar and proper to the ſame perſon; becauſe the words *God*, *Lord*, *Jehovah*, and *Father*, are ſometimes applied to one perſon, ſometimes to another; while at other times they are not perſonal, but general names of the *divine nature*. That in the *Lord of Hoſts*[6], ſitting upon his throne, and ſpeaking of himſelf in the *plural* to the Prophet *Iſaiah*, there was not *one* perſon only, but *three*; The *Father*, *Jeſus*, and the *Holy Ghoſt*, all expreſſed under one name in the Old Teſtament, but perſonally diſtinguiſhed to us by three different ones in the new, where this matter is referred to.

In the *fourth* and laſt Chapter, the paſſages of the Scripture have been laid together, and made to unite their beams in one common center, the *Unity* of the Trinity. Which unity is not metaphorical and figurative, but ſtrict and real: and there can be no real unity in God, but that of his *nature*, *eſſence*, or *ſubſtance*, all of which are ſynonymous terms: this unity conſidered *in itſelf*, is altogether incomprehenſible: but it is one thing to read and to know that there *is* a divine nature, and another thing to *deſcribe* it. That it is proved to be an unity of eſſence; 1ſt. becauſe the three perſons are

[1] XXV. [2] Chap. III. Art. I. [3] V. VI. VII. VIII. [4] IX. X. [5] XVIII. [6] XIX.

all

all comprehended under the ſame individual and ſupreme appellation. They are the one *Lord* abſolutely ſo called [1]. *The Creator of the world*, and the *God of Iſrael* [2]. 2dly, becauſe they partake in common of the name *Jehovah* [3], which, being interpreted, means the *divine Eſſence:* and what it ſignifies in one perſon, it muſt alſo ſignify in the others; as truly as the ſingular name *Adam*, in its appellative capacity, expreſſes the common nature of all mankind. And this name neither is nor can be communicated, without a contradiction, to any derived or inferior nature, as well on account of its ſignification as its application, which is expreſsly reſtrained to *one only*. 3dly, It is farther proved, in that the *authority* [4], the ſecret *mind* [5] or counſel, and the *power* [6] by which all things are eſtabliſhed and directed, is aſcribed to *Chriſt* and the *Spirit* in common with God the Father; and that in the ſame exerciſe of it, and upon the ſame occaſions. 4thly, becauſe there is a participation of ſuch divine *attributes* [7] as cannot ſubſiſt but where they are original. Our underſtanding, if it be moderately inſtructed, will ſatisfy us there can be *one only* who is *eternal*, and poſſeſſed of *holineſs*, *truth*, *life*, &c. in and from himſelf. Yet the whole Trinity is *eternal*, *holy*, *true*, *living*, and *omnipreſent:* therefore theſe *three* were, and will be *one God* from everlaſting to everlaſting. 5thly, and laſtly, becauſe there is a concurrence of the whole undivided Godhead in all thoſe *acts* [8], every one of which have in them the character of a divine wiſdom and omnipotence; and expreſs ſuch an intimate union and communion of the Holy Trinity, as the underſtanding of man cannot reach, and which no words can explain. For though it is and muſt be *one God* who doth all theſe things, yet it is *the Father*, the *Son*, and the *Holy Spirit*, who *gave us our being*, *inſtruct* and illuminate us, *lead* us, *ſpeak* to us, and are *preſent* with us; who give *authority* to the church, *raiſe the dead*, *ſanctify* the elect, and perform *every* divine and ſpiritual operation.

[1] Chap. IV. Art. I. III. [2] IV. [3] II. [4] V. [5] VI. [6] VII. [7] VIII. IX. X. XI. XII. [8] XIII. &c. ad fin.

This

This is the God revealed to us in the holy Scripture; very different from the *Deity* ſo much talked of in our ſyſtematical ſchemes of *natural* divinity; which with all its wiſdom, never yet thought of a *Chriſt*, or an *Holy Ghoſt*, by whom *nature*, now fallen and blind, is to be reformed, exalted, and ſaved. The Bible we know to be the infallible word of God; the rule of our faith and obedience. I find this doctrine revealed in it; therefore I firmly believe and ſubmit to it. And as the Liturgy of the Church of *England* hath affirmed the ſame in all its offices, and contains nothing contradictory thereto; I believe *that* alſo: and hope the God whom we ſerve will defend it againſt all attempts toward reforming *Chriſtianity* out of it: that the Church militant here on earth, may continue to agree in this fundamental doctrine with the Church triumphant in heaven. For there the Angels *reſt not day and night*, praiſing this *Thrice-Holy* [1], bleſſed and glorious Trinity. They have neither time nor inclination to diſpute againſt that Glory, which they cannot ſtedfaſtly behold. And had we a little more humility and devotion, we ſhould not abound ſo much with diſputation. If, in ſuch a ſubject as this, we truſt to our own reaſon, and it ſhould prove at laſt to have betrayed us into error, irreligion, and blaſphemy; what ſhall we have to ſay in excuſe for ourſelves? we ſhall not dare to plead the dignity and ſtrength of our rational faculties before the tribunal of Him, who came into the world to bring the wiſdom of it to nought. And if the Religion of *Jeſus Chriſt* is to be corrected and ſoftened till it becomes agreeable to the natural thoughts and imaginations of the human heart, then in vain was it ſaid—*Bleſſed is he whoſoever ſhall not be* offended *in me.*

As for him, who is convinced that God is wiſer than himſelf; who *believes* as he ought, and as the Catholic Church of Chriſt hath given him an example from the beginning; *his* danger lies on the other ſide: and while I venture to give him warning of it, *I beſeech him to ſuffer the word of*

[1] Chap. III. Art. XIX.

exhorta-

exhortation, and to take in good part the *faithful wounds of a friend*. Let him take care then, that while he values his orthodoxy, he be not led unawares to *overvalue it*, by drawing falſe concluſions from it, and conceiting himſelf to be *already perfect*. If he knows and believes in the true God, he doth well: but let not that which is an honour to him be any encouragement to diſhonour God; the knowledge of whom will only ſerve to encreaſe our condemnation, if we live in any *luſt of concupiſcence, even as the Gentiles, who knew him not*. And though it be the *faith* of a Chriſtian, and not his *morality*, that diſtinguiſhes him from the reſt of mankind; yet that faith muſt appear in the conduct of his life; even as love to a friend is beſt witneſſed by a readineſs to do him ſervice. It is true, the ſervice is not the love, nor of equal value with it; yet the love that refuſes the ſervice will be accounted as nothing. The *myſtery of faith* is an invaluable treaſure; but the veſſel that contains it muſt be clean and undefiled; it muſt be *held in a pure conſcience*; as the *manna*, that glorious ſymbol of the *word of faith*, preached to us by the Goſpel, was confined to the Tabernacle, and preſerved in a veſſel of gold. A mind that is conformed to this world, and given up to its pleaſures, though it repeat the creed without queſtioning a ſingle article of it, will be abhorred in the ſight of God, as a veſſel unfit for the maſter's uſe; and unworthy, becauſe unprepared, to ſtand in the *moſt holy place*. It is the great excellence of faith, that it can produce ſuch a tranſformation in the life and manners, as no other principle has any power to do: and many are poſſeſſed of this truth without applying it to their own advantage. It is to be feared, that a conſciouſneſs of this damps their zeal, and creates that poor, pitiful, cowardly indifference, ſo much in vogue; which if it had not by accident found the name of *charity*, would have been aſhamed to ſhew its face in a Chriſtian country. They are cold and backward to promote any religious converſation; they will not appear to be in earneſt about their faith in the eyes of the world, leſt they ſhould be forced to abridge ſomewhat from the gaiety of their lives, and to *live* as they

ſpeak,

ſpeak. But let them remember, that *without holineſs no man ſhall ſee the Lord:* no droſs or impurity of this world will be ſuffered to continue in his ſight. And in this, he is no hard maſter, *reaping* where he hath not *ſown*, and requiring the fruit of good works without giving us ſtrength and ability to bring them forth. He has provided for us the precious blood of the Lamb, and offered to us the aſſiſtance of his Holy Spirit, that we may be enabled to *ſerve* that living God in whom we *believe*. If we are purged by *him*, we ſhall be *clean:* if *he* waſhes us, *we* ſhall be *whiter than ſnow:* and when the kingdom of God ſhall come, and his glory ſhall appear, we ſhall be prepared to *behold his face in righteouſneſs*.

This, and no other, is my ſincereſt wiſh and prayer for every Chriſtian, who ſhall give himſelf the trouble to peruſe theſe papers, in which I pretend to no merit but that of a *tranſcriber*; which I ſhall always eſteem to be honour enough, where the word of God is my original. And if they ſhould be any way inſtrumental to promote ſo good an end, he will not have read, nor ſhall I have written, in vain.

A LET-

A

LETTER

TO THE

COMMON PEOPLE,

IN ANSWER TO SOME

POPULAR ARGUMENTS againſt the TRINITY,

BEING AN

APPENDIX

TO THE

CATHOLIC DOCTRINE OF THE TRINITY.

A LETTER TO THE COMMON PEOPLE.

MEN AND BRETHREN,

AS Chriſtians and members of the Church of *England*, you have been taught, that the True God, whom you are bound to believe and worſhip, is a *Trinity in Unity*. In the *Name* of theſe three Perſons, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghoſt, you have been *baptized*: and in the Litany are directed to pray to this *Holy, bleſſed, and glorious Trinity, three perſons and one God*, that he would *have mercy upon us miſerable ſinners*.

From the firſt propagation of the Goſpel, there has been a ſort of men in the Chriſtian church, who had too high an opinion of their own knowledge and wiſdom to ſubmit quietly to this doctrine. They pretended it was contrary to their Reaſon and common ſenſe, and impoſſible in the Nature of Things, that the true God ſhould be made manifeſt in the fleſh for the Salvation of the world; and hence they argued, that the Incarnation muſt either have been a deluſion, a fact brought to paſs only in ſhew and appearance; or that the Perſon incarnate muſt have been ſome created Being, far inferior in power and dignity to the divine Nature itſelf.

About three hundred years after the death of Chriſt, when Paganiſm, or the worſhip of idols, was loſing its influence in the Roman empire, this Hereſy, being come to its full growth, did immediately ſupply the place of it, and proſpered to ſuch a degree, that it overſpread the greateſt part of the Eaſt, and ended at laſt in the impoſture of the falſe prophet *Mahomet*; whoſe doctrine was readily embraced wherever *Arianiſm* prevailed, and no where elſe among Chriſtians; and his diſciples do at this day moſt zealouſly deny that Trinity which you worſhip.

When the Teachers of the Church found themſelves diſturbed, and their people corrupted, more and more by the daily increaſe of this hereſy; upwards of three hundred Chriſtian biſhops, many of whom had been tortured and maimed in the heathen perſecutions, aſſembled together at the city of *Nice*, in *Bithynia*, and one *Arius*, a principal promoter of this wickedneſs, was ſummoned to appear before them: his doctrine and writings were condemned; the Faith which theſe holy men had brought with them to the council was declared, and is now preſerved in the *Nicene Creed*; which form we make uſe of in the church becauſe it comprehends the ſenſe of our faith in a few words. But we do not reſt our belief upon the *Authority* of any human form, becauſe the doctrine therein expreſſed is ſecured by the unqueſtionable authority of the Old and New Teſtaments.

The Evidence of this faith, as it is found in the Scripture, I have endeavoured to extract and methodize in the beſt manner I could. The work was made public rather with an humble and charitable deſire to aſſiſt the ſtudies of the younger clergy, than to inſtruct the common people; and therefore it was firſt printed at *Oxford*. Nevertheleſs, I am well perſuaded, that ſo many of the arguments therein contained are level to all capacities, that an unlearned reader may thence be able to ſatisfy himſelf, and inform his Chriſtian neighbours. I ſhall therefore have no occaſion in this place to urge any new evidence from the Scripture, but only to refer to ſome of the old; it being the deſign of this Addreſs to obviate a ſet of *popular* arguments, which have been

been made uſe of by ſome nameleſs writers to turn your affections from the doctrine of the Trinity; moſt of which might be applied with as much propriety to prejudice you againſt any other article of faith in the Chriſtian Religion.

I. You know, my dear brethren, that *pride* is a very prevailing paſſion in human nature; and unleſs we are very much upon our guard, and are fortified with the true principles of Chriſtian humility, we are all of us in danger of being enſnared by it. Men are proud of their clothes, and proud of their riches, and proud of their titles; but, above all, they are proud of their underſtanding. Some men are endued with a ſtrength of mind which enables them to bear up with cheerfulneſs under the common trials of ſickneſs, and loſſes, and diſappointments; while, perhaps, the ſame men cannot endure the thought of being *cheated* and *impoſed upon*, becauſe it is a reflection upon their *underſtanding*. Our adverſaries, therefore, hoping to make the ſtronger impreſſion, apply themſelves firſt of all to your pride, and inform you, that this doctrine of the Trinity is *impoſed upon your conſciences by Church Authority* [1]. But if the fact be laid before you, it will ſoon appear that no point of faith is thus impoſed upon you by the Church of England. The points of faith which you are required to believe are interwoven with all the forms and offices of our public Liturgy. They are collected together for the younger ſort of people in the Church Catechiſm; and for all teachers, whether clergy or laity, they are drawn out more at large in the *Articles of Religion*, generally printed at the end of the Book of Common Prayer. So that all the articles of faith being impoſed in the ſame manner, it will follow, that they are *all* impoſed by *Church Authority*, or none of them. Let us put it to the trial, and begin with the firſt article of the *Creed*—*I believe in God the Father Almighty*. How is this article impoſed? Does the Church determine by her own authority

[1] See the title-page of a pamphlet called "An Appeal to the Common "Senſe of all Chriſtian People," &c. printed for *Millar*, in the *Strand*.

whether there is a God or not? And ſo for the reſt. Does the Church determine whether there is a *Chriſt*, or an *Holy Ghoſt?* whether there will be a *reſurrection of the dead*, and a *life everlaſting?* Certainly the Church neither does nor can pretend to determine any of theſe things for us; becauſe where any thing is determined by authority, ſuch authority muſt be ſuperior to what it determines: to ſuppoſe which, in this caſe, would be equally falſe and preſumptuous. Therefore the truth of the matter is this; that the Church does only declare that faith which it has received; and inſtead of her *impoſing*, this faith is *impoſed* upon the Church by the uncontrolable authority of God in the Holy Scripture, to which every private Chriſtian is referred for the proper evidence of any particular doctrine, and for that of the Trinity amongſt the reſt. Thoſe articles which are of a nature inferior to the Church itſelf, are the only ſubjects of Church authority. Thus, as the *body is more* than the *raiment* that is worn upon it; ſo the life and being of the Church is ſuperior to thoſe outward regulations, which ſerve only to the order, decency, and well-being of it; and which the Church may, for this reaſon, appoint, alter, and improve by her own authority. But if any man informs you, that points of faith, or moral practice, are *impoſed upon your conſciences* by the ſame authority, he has either miſtaken the caſe, or is himſelf endeavouring to impoſe upon your underſtanding.

II. But "the Goſpel," they ſay, "was deſigned for perſons of all capacities," and unleſs *all perſons of common ſenſe* are qualified to underſtand what the Lord requires of them, we muſt "charge Almighty God with dealing unfairly with his creatures [2]." Now if the Goſpel be ſo eaſy, that nothing but bare common ſenſe is wanted for the underſtanding of it, why do theſe authors write ſo many books to help you to underſtand it in the *Arian* ſenſe? If you are able, as they flatter you, to inſtruct yourſelves out of the Goſpel, then their practice is a contradiction to their principle, and

[2] Ibid. p. 2.

their

their labour is ſuperfluous by their own confeſſion. My brethren, we do not argue in this manner; we know that you have ſenſe and ability to underſtand the merits of a cauſe, and are ready to hear reaſon, when it is plainly repreſented to you: but if you were able to make all things intelligible to your ownſelves, we ſhould neither preach to you, nor write books for you.

When God appointed *Teachers* in his Church (1 *Cor.* xii. 28.) he certainly did not ſuppoſe that the congregation would be equally capable of teaching themſelves. If this were true, then indeed God would ſeem to have dealt unfairly with Chriſtian people, by appointing a miniſtry of learned men, and providing for their inſtruction, as if bare common ſenſe, with the Bible in its hand, were not ſo ſufficient as our adverſaries would have you believe; in oppoſition to *us*, but not to themſelves.

The Duty of a Chriſtian Miniſter is to *teach*; his ſtudies are intended to qualify him, and his time is ſet apart for that purpoſe. For the bulk of the people, God hath appointed labour and buſineſs of another kind, as neceſſary to ſupport themſelves and their families; and *their* duty is to *hear*. But if God has required you to do our work and your own too, then your lot is hard indeed. You will not, therefore, think it any reflection upon your common ſenſe, that God has appointed an order of Teachers in his Church, who will never deſire you to believe what they are not at all times ready to prove; but will rather beſeech him that theſe Teachers may be endued with faith and affection to fulfil the *labour of love* to which they are called, and courage to declare that truth which they have learned from the Holy Scriptures; and by thus praying for the Clergy, you will convince them, that God hath added *Grace* to your *common ſenſe*, and that you practiſe that Chriſtian charity which is more acceptable in His ſight than the attainments of learning and knowledge; for theſe are no more than temporary qualifications, and are to be uſed only as means; but Charity is the end and perfection of all.

III. They tell you, moreover, that people of all ſorts have a *right to judge for themſelves in matters of Religion* [3], As this principle very nearly affects the peace of the Chriſtian world, and the ſalvation of individuals, I would adviſe you to enquire ſtrictly into the meaning of theſe terms; and to conſider how far they may be juſtified, and how far they are to be condemned. *Right* is a pleaſing thing, and *liberty* is an old temptation; but if any Chriſtian doth ſo aſſert his right againſt an human law, as to depart from his obedience and ſubjection to the divine law, ſuch a right will do him no good when he has got it, becauſe it will not protect him under his religious miſtakes againſt the ſuperior judgment of God; ſo far from it, that it is probably one of the chief miſtakes he will have to anſwer for.

When they aſſert that you are to *judge* for yourſelves, they muſt mean, either that you are to judge of truth by its proper evidence; or that by a certain prerogative of conſcience, you are to *gueſs* for yourſelves what is right or wrong, without any evidence at all. If only the former of theſe Senſes is intended, they ſay no more than we all ſay, and what the Church hath ſaid ever ſince the Reformation. If the latter is alſo allowed, and unlearned people have a right to follow their conſcience (that is, their *inclination*) without any evidence, or with ſome falſe and partial repreſentation of it; then it will follow, that the difference between good and evil is not real, but imaginary; that truth and falſhood, like temporary faſhions, are not the objects of reaſon but of fancy; which doctrines, if admitted in their full latitude, would turn all reaſon and religion upſide down: and I think they have done it in part already.

When they come to apply this principle, they take occaſion to add, that *if you are convinced* of ſuch doctrines as they teach you, *viz.* that God Almighty *is only one and the ſame perſon*; that the Holy Ghoſt is *firſt miniſter* in the *government of the church*; that he has *angels to aſſiſt him*; that Chriſt is to be honoured with *mediatorial worſhip*, &c. "then "you have a *Right* to *proteſt againſt the Athanaſian Creed* [4]."

[3] Ibid. p. 133. [4] P. 115.

But

But I ſay, neither you nor I can poſſibly have any ſuch right as this, unleſs we are convinced by *ſufficient reaſons*. Our perſuaſion can never be turned into any argument; unleſs it be alſo maintained, that a man who is perſuaded can never be miſtaken. The *Mahometans* are convinced, that their *Alcoran* is a divine revelation; that all Chriſtians are guilty of blaſphemy in believing, and idolatry in worſhipping, a Trinity in Unity; and that they have a right to proteſt againſt the foundations of the Goſpel of Jeſus Chriſt. But as they are convinced of theſe things for very *bad reaſons*, we pity the blindneſs of their underſtanding, and only laugh at the right they have aſſumed, as one of thoſe many groundleſs caſtles, which human vanity and bigotry have builded in the air.

But allowing that *Arians* thus convinced have a right of proteſting, what are orthodox *Chriſtians* to do on the other hand? have *they* no right? does a perſuaſion confer a right on one ſide, and none on the other? that would be very unreaſonable. Therefore we, who are convinced that the Creed of *Athanaſius* is more agreeable to the Scripture than the doctrines of *Arianiſm*, have a right to remonſtrate againſt the repealing of it; though we can never expect to do ſo, without being perſecuted and reviled for it as long as we live.

IV. To prejudice your minds againſt the *Athanaſian Creed*, they inform you, that the doctrine of the Trinity, as there ſet forth, is *not expreſſed in the words of Scripture: there are no ſuch propoſitions to be found in the declarations of Chriſt and his Apoſtles* [5]. By this it is meant, that you do not find any ſuch expreſſions as—*Trinity in Unity—not three Eternals, but one Eternal*—and ſuch like. The beſt courſe you can take upon this occaſion, is to argue with them upon their own principles, which generally ſtop a man's mouth ſooner than any other. Aſk them, where they find it aſſerted in the words of Scripture, *Almighty God is one ſupreme intelligent Being, or Perſon?* Aſk them, in what chapter or verſe, Chriſt

[5] P. 5.

or his Apoſtles did ever declare, that *the Holy Spirit* is *firſt Miniſter in the Government* of the Church; and where it is ſaid that he has *Angels for his Aſſiſtants?* Aſk them, again, where they meet with the propoſition—*the worſhip of Chriſt is inferior, or mediatorial?* And you might aſk them twenty more ſuch queſtions, which they can never anſwer upon their own principles: ſo that they have employed an Argument to corrupt you, which returns upon themſelves, and with this diſadvantage on their ſide, that they have departed from the *ſenſe* as well as the *words* of Scripture; but the Church, if, beſides the words of Scripture, it uſes others, does ſtill retain ſuch a ſenſe, as the words of Scripture will clearly juſtify.

V. But leſt you ſhould believe this, they aſſure you the *Athanaſian* Creed has propoſed a downright contradiction as an Article of Faith; and if this be the caſe, then indeed we muſt allow that ſuch a contradiction cannot be juſtified by the words of Scripture. "You muſt believe (ſay they) if "this Creed has any weight, that three Gods is one God [6]." If you examine the Creed itſelf, you will find no ſuch doctrine as they have put into it; but, on the contrary, that the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghoſt, are NOT THREE GODS, but ONE GOD; and again, "We are "*forbidden*, by the Catholic Religion, to ſay, there be Three "Gods." I pray you to obſerve this; and to conſider with yourſelves, whether our adverſaries, ſuppoſing them to be ſatisfied in their own conſciences that they were able to confute the Catholic doctrine of *Three perſons, and one God*, would have endeavoured to take advantage of your ſimplicity, by putting this falſe notion of *Three Gods* into the place of it?

VI. Upon other occaſions, they try to give you an ill opinion of our eccleſiaſtical forms, by calling them the *decrees of fallible men* [7], and *Creeds of human invention* [8]; which is a very mean objection, unleſs they who make it, and propoſe a contrary ſort of belief, are themſelves *infallible*.

[6] P. 87. [7] P. 5. [8] P. 37.

We

We readily own that the perſons, who drew up the forms uſed in the Church were men like ourſelves. But did they deliver the doctrine of theſe forms as their *own* doctrine, or as the doctrine of Almighty God in the Scripture? If they delivered it as their own, then their fallibility would be a pertinent conſideration: but if it is the doctrine of the Scripture, then the fallibility of the men who delivered it, is nothing to the purpoſe; and as ſuch only we take it, uſing our own private judgment in relation to the *men*, but ſubmitting our reaſon to the infallible *Spirit of God*. A judge who ſits upon the bench by the king's authority, to determine civil cauſes, is a fallible man: but ſo far as he makes the law of the land the rule of his judgment, he is infallible. And we never attempt to perſuade you, that the teachers of our Church are infallible, but ſo far only as they make the Scripture the rule of their judgment. Therefore, when you hear them reflected upon as fallible men, do them ſo much juſtice as to aſk yourſelves the queſtion, whether they who make this objection are themſelves infallible? Is not the Author of an *Appeal to the Common Senſe of all Chriſtian People*, a fallible man, when he tells you, in terms of human invention, that God is one *ſupreme intelligent Agent, or Perſon?* that the Holy Spirit is his *firſt Miniſter?* that Chriſt did *really ſuffer in his higheſt capacity*[9]*?* that he is to be honoured with *Mediatorial Worſhip?* Doth he not deliver theſe doctrines as a fallible man? Yea verily, not only as one who *may be*, but who actually *is*, deceived, if the Scripture is true.

VII. As a farther encouragement to oppoſition, you are taught that any body may deny the Trinity upon *Proteſtant principles*. And here give me leave to tell you, my friends, that there are ſome people who ſeem to think it is the profeſſion of a *Proteſtant*, not to *believe* but to *deny*; and that a man is no good Proteſtant, unleſs he diſputes every thing that falls in his way. Had this been the true Chriſtian ſpirit, our Saviour would probably have recommended it to his

[9] P. 57.

hearers,

hearers, by ſetting a bear, or a tyger, or a fox, before them, and propoſing theſe creatures as the beſt examples of it. Inſtead of which he ſhewed them what his followers ought to be, by preſenting to them a little child as their pattern; whence the people were to underſtand, that as a little child receives the inſtruction of its parents, without any of the perverſe diſputings of a corrupted mind; ſo ought they to receive the kingdom of heaven, that is, the doctrine of the Goſpel. This is a diſpoſition lovely in the ſight of God and men, and ſo far from rendering the poſſeſſors of it more liable to be impoſed upon, that none but perſons of this temper are able to diſcern the truth when it is offered, according to that expreſſion of Chriſt—*I thank thee, O Father, Lord of heaven and earth, that thou haſt hid theſe things from the wiſe and prudent, and haſt revealed them unto babes.* There would be more peace in the world than there is now, if men would but remember this; and there would be more wiſdom too: for none are ſo blind as they who are always boaſting of the quickneſs of their own eye-ſight; they are ſo filled up with the opinion of their underſtanding every thing, that it is impoſſible to make them underſtand when they are miſtaken.

But it may be dangerous to enlarge any farther upon this ſubject, leſt it ſhould be ſuſpected that I am leading you into Popery.

There is, however, a very falſe light, in which your liberty, as Proteſtants, is repreſented to you, and therefore I think it my duty to make you aware of it. "*No Pro-*" *teſtant* (they ſay) can, conſiſtently with acknowledging " the Scripture as the only rule, charge you with the leaſt " preſumption, for bringing *decrees not found there* to the teſt " of a rational enquiry [1]." The decrees here alluded to is the doctrine of a *Trinity in Unity*. As to myſelf, my whole Book bears witneſs for me, that I thought it my own duty, and would have it alſo be your practice, to bring this doctrine to the teſt of Scripture, as the only ſufficient rule in ſuch a caſe. And I am perſuaded, no reaſonable Chriſtian will

[1] P. 6.

have

have any objection to your proceedings, if you examine in the beſt manner you are able, *whether the Catholic doctrine of the Trinity is found in the Scripture, or not.* But we ſhall charge you juſtly with a great deal of preſumption, if you undertake to compare it with Scripture as a decree *not found* in Scripture: for this is to beg the queſtion; that is, to take it for granted that a decree is *falſe*, and then compare it with the Scripture to ſee whether it be *true*. If this is your method, you muſt unavoidably conclude as your adviſers have done before you. To prevent which, I recommend thoſe words of the wiſe man—*He that anſwereth a matter, before he heareth it, it is folly, and ſhame unto him* [2]. A Proteſtant who enters upon a mock enquiry with theſe prejudices and anticipations, is guilty of great injuſtice towards his Chriſtian brethren, and is all the while putting a trick upon himſelf.

If you conſult the diſcourſe to the reader, prefixed to the *Catholic Doctrine*, you will ſee, toward the latter end of it, upon what grounds I have charged the learned Dr. *Clarke*, and his followers, with this unfair practice of *bringing* to the Scripture that knowledge which they ought to *receive* from it. Perhaps you never heard any hiſtory of that Author, therefore I will tell you thus much of him: that he was a man greatly to be reſpected for his temper and ſcholarſhip; but it happened, unfortunately for his character as a Chriſtian, that he wrote a celebrated book upon the *Being and Attributes* (or perfections) *of God*; and having diſcovered, as he thought, by the force of his own wit, what God was and muſt be in all reſpects, he rejected the Chriſtian doctrine of the Trinity; and to put the beſt face he could upon his Unbelief, ſpent much of the remainder of his life in writing ambiguous comments, and finding various readings, that is, in *picking holes* in the Bible.

The Author of an *Appeal to the Common Senſe of all Chriſtian People*, calls him, *the immortal Dr. Clarke* [3], and has borrowed from him the ſubſtance of that whole book, which was the worſt thing he ever wrote in his life. The glittering

[2] Prov. xiv. 13. [3] *Preface.*

characters

characters of *great, learned,* and *immortal,* are frequently thrown out with an intention to dazzle the eyes of common readers; and chiefly by thoſe writers who are moſt forward to accuſe us of an implicit obedience to *human authority,* and *the decrees of fallible and intereſted men.* But if you leave the faith and hope of a Chriſtian, your loſs will be equally great, whether you are tempted to it by the Pope of Rome, or by the *immortal Dr. Samuel Clarke.*

VIII. Now we are upon the ſubject of human characters, I will propoſe to you, on the other hand, thoſe learned and godly Martyrs, who were concerned in reforming the Church of England from the errors of Popery. If the doctrine of the Trinity is ſo contrary to the Scripture, as our adverſaries would have you believe, how did it happen that theſe men, who were certainly endued with all the advantages and ornaments of human learning, and had the Bible ſo often in their hands, that they tranſlated every word of it into the Engliſh tongue, ſuffered this doctrine of the Trinity to ſtand unreformed? I will ſhew you how the *Arians* endeavoured to ſolve this difficulty, which is indeed a very great one. They ſay, "it may fairly be preſumed, that as they "were juſt come out of the groſs corruptions of Popery, "they did not ſee the whole truth as it is in Jeſus [4]." So that notwithſtanding their reſolution to reform, yet Popery hung about them ſtill, and they did not reform *ſo much* as they ought to have done. But if you are to be guided by preſumptions, you will ſoon diſcover, that the fairer preſumption is on the other ſide, when the nature of men and things upon ſuch occaſions is rightly conſidered. When tares, growing amongſt wheat, are to be plucked up, there is not nearly ſo much danger that any tares ſhould be left behind, as that ſome of the wheat ſhould be plucked up along with them. If you have a crooked ſtick in your hand, and would make it ſtraight, the firſt ſtep you take is to bend it too much the contrary way; after which it may come to be right at laſt. Juſt ſo it happens, that if mankind

[4] Ibid. p. 4.

are

are offended with any thing, and ſenſible of a paſt error, they are apt to fly from it with ſuch an undiſtinguiſhing averſion, as to fall, before they are aware, into the contrary extreme: and their prejudice, if they have any, is not *for*, but *againſt*, what they are correcting. Inſtead of doing too little, they are in danger of being in ſuch a heat as to *over-do* every thing they ſet about: whence it is moſt naturally to be inferred, that our Divines, who reformed the errors of Popery, were not then inclined to act in favour of Popery. A ſpirit of Reformation is an excellent thing; and I wiſh to God it abounded amongſt us more than it does, provided it would exert its force againſt thoſe real corruptions, which are but too viſible to all ſerious members of the Church of England; but unleſs it is tempered with great wiſdom and caution, it degenerates naturally into a ſpirit of contradiction. Which things being conſidered, I would adviſe you not to be influenced by any preſumptive reflections upon the judgment of our firſt Reformers, till the *Arians* are able to prove, by ſome *direct evidence*, that the doctrine of the Trinity, as now expreſſed in our Creeds and Offices, is an unreformed article of *Popery*.

IX. Our adverſaries lay ſo great a ſtreſs upon this charge of popery, and find it ſo convenient at every turn, that they are determined to make papiſts of us at any rate; therefore they aſſure you, in words not fit for a Chriſtian to repeat, that "the Church of *Rome* had as good a right to "impoſe the worſhip of angels, and the *Virgin Mary*, upon "the conſciences of men, as the church of *England* had to "impoſe the worſhip of the Holy Spirit as God, and of "Three Perſons as one God [3]." The papiſts, without queſtion, will thank them for putting the worſhip of the *Virgin Mary* upon a level with that of the *Holy Spirit*. But this reſpect being paid to the papiſts at our expence, it is proper you ſhould be made acquainted with the merits of this affair.

[3] P. 123.

The papiſts do not pretend to juſtify their worſhip of the bleſſed Virgin by any precept or example of the Scripture; but tell you, in ſome fabulous legends, what heavenly favours have been granted to her worſhippers; that ignorant people may be encouraged to the like idolatry. But where will the *Arians* find any ſuch ſtories impoſed by the church of England, to juſtify the worſhip of the Holy Ghoſt?

If you aſk the papiſts how they can prove that we ought to worſhip the bleſſed Virgin, the beſt argument they can allege, is the practice and infallibility of their own *Roman Catholic* church: but do we ever attempt to quiet your ſcruples with any pretenſions to unſcriptural authority, or perſonal infallibility?

Let us paſs at length to the Scripture itſelf, which will ſhew you how dangerous it is for unlearned and well-meaning people to truſt themſelves in the hands of an *Arian* reaſoner.

Doth the Scripture, in any chapter or verſe of it, call the bodies of Chriſtian people the *Temple* of the *Virgin Mary*? But the apoſtle St. *Paul* ſaith—*Know ye not that your body* is *the* Temple *of the* Holy Ghoſt [6]? And what is the uſe of a temple? Is it not an houſe of prayer, praiſe, and ſacrifice? He that has a temple muſt be entitled to divine honours in it; or we ſhall be guilty of *idolatry* when we worſhip him in his *own temple*; which is abſurd. The apoſtle himſelf makes this practical inference in the words which immediately follow—*Therefore glorify God in your body.* And if the word *God* in this place denotes an object of worſhip excluſive of the Holy Spirit, (as our adverſaries are obliged to ſuppoſe, or give up the point) then it will follow, that the *Temple* belongs to one Being, and the glory and worſhip to another; which is one of thoſe many ſtrange things you are bound to believe, before you can be of the *Arian* opinion [7].

Can you find it any where written in the Scripture, that the angels of heaven worſhipped the *Virgin Mary*? Read the ſixth chapter of the prophet *Iſaiah*, in which the *Sera-*

[6] See *Cath. Doct.* Chap. ii. Art. 10. [7] You may ſee the Author of the *Appeal* driven to this abſurdity, and endeavouring ſeriouſly to uphold it, if you conſult his book, p. 61, 62.

phim

phim aſcribe *Glory* to that *Lord of Hoſts* who ſpake the following words to the prophet—*Go, and tell this people, hear ye indeed, but underſtand not*, &c. Now St. *Paul* teaches us, in the laſt chapter of the *Acts*, that theſe words were ſpoken by the *Holy Ghoſt*. So that when we ſay, "Glory be to "the Father, and to the Son, and to the HOLY GHOST," we have the example of the ſeraphim in heaven for this way of worſhip; a conſideration which will make us eaſy under all the oppoſition it meets with here below in the world [8].

When you have reflected upon theſe things, then you may aſk yourſelves the queſtion, Whether Chriſtians who are *born of God* are any where ſaid to be born of the Virgin Mary? Whether the Apoſtles, who were *called of God* to the miniſtry of the Goſpel, were called of the Virgin Mary? Whether the Virgin Mary can be *tempted* and *blaſphemed* by ſinners? Whether ſhe conferred divine *inſpiration* upon the prophets of the Old, or the apoſtles of the New Teſtament? Whether we are baptized in the NAME, that is, into the *religion* and *worſhip* of the Virgin Mary? But all theſe things, and many more, are true of the *Holy Spirit*; who dwelling in our body as in his own temple, is therein to be ſerved and glorified; and being alſo worſhipped and glorified, together with the Father and the Son, by the angels of heaven, I think we have a better right to worſhip him here upon earth, than the papiſts have to worſhip the Virgin Mary.

Our adverſaries would perſuade you we have ſo little to ſay upon this ſubject from the Scripture, that it is a great favour in them not to *triumph* over us, and *inſult* us for it [9]. As if it were no inſult upon the Church of England to ſuppoſe her worſhip as groundleſs as the idolatry of the papiſts!

The Argument drawn from the words of *Iſaiah* with thoſe of St. *Paul* is very plain, and very cloſe: "The Lord of "Hoſts, whom the ſeraphim glorified, ſpake thoſe words

[8] See Cath. Doct. Chap. III. Art. XIX. [9] See Appeal, p. 104. note.

"which

" which were ſpoken by the Holy Ghoſt: therefore the " Holy Ghoſt is the Lord of Hoſts whom the ſeraphim " glorified." Yet the author of the *Appeal* declares, that *nothing can be more fallacious than this way of reaſoning*, and that he *could in the ſame manner conclude that Iſaiah is the Lord*, becauſe the words of the Lord (*I was found of them that ſought me not*) are applied to *Iſaiah*, *Rom.* x. 20. Where the Apoſtle thus introduces them—*But Eſaias is very bold, and ſaith, I was found of them that ſought me not*[1]. This author, I believe, is the firſt Chriſtian who did ever ſuppoſe, that the Apoſtle *applied* the words in this verſe *to* the perſon of *Eſaias*; or thoſe in the preceding to the perſon of *Moſes*. This, however, is not worth inſiſting upon, becauſe he has miſtaken the nature of the argument. The force of it lies here; that the *ſpeaker* of the words above-mentioned, as they ſtand in the prophet *Iſaiah*, is called by the name of *the Lord of Hoſts*, was *glorified* by angels, ſeated upon the throne of heaven, and ſent a prophet by his own authority; and this ſpeaker, as St. *Paul* informs us, was the Holy Ghoſt. If the Scripture doth any where aſſert that *Iſaiah* ſpake under the ſame name, and with the ſame circumſtances, then we ſhall be ready to allow that the caſes are parallel, and will worſhip *him* alſo. Had the objector expreſſed himſelf clearly, his meaning would have appeared to be this: that becauſe God ſpeaks by a prophet, and ſpeaks alſo by his Holy Spirit, as much may be inferred in honour of the one as of the other. But when God ſpeaks by a prophet, he ſpeaks by *another*; when he ſpeaks by his Spirit, he ſpeaks *by himſelf*. He reconciled the world *by* Jeſus Chriſt, but not as by another; for *God was in Chriſt reconciling the world to himſelf*. So when he ſpeaks by his Spirit, he ſpeaks by himſelf; as truly as a man utters his voice by the *ſpirit* or breath of his *own* mouth; or ſearcheth his own thoughts by the operation of his own mind. I am not afraid to inſiſt upon this compariſon, becauſe I borrow it from St. Paul: and it demonſtrates ſuch an unity between God and the Spirit of

[1] P. 63.

God,

God, as Chriſtians believe, and Arians do not: nor do they attempt to get over it by any ſolution I have yet ſeen, which will not alſo prove that a man and his ſpirit muſt be two different beings; or that we may correct an Apoſtle's argument till it ſquares with our own opinion. In this manner reaſons the author of the Appeal. *The Spirit is repreſented as a Perſon who ſearcheth the deep things of God, and conſequently he cannot be God*[2]. But if he cannot be God, becauſe he ſearcheth the things of God; then the ſpirit of a man cannot be a man, becauſe it knoweth the things of a man. But obſerve how he proceeds: "No man, ſays he," "can know, or make known to others the thoughts of a "man, but *either* the man himſelf, *or he to whomſoever the* "*man will diſcover them.*" In which words the premiſes are manifeſtly changed. The Apoſtle ſaith, *what man knoweth the things of a man, but the ſpirit of man which is in him*; that is, the man himſelf: but the author of the Appeal ſays, *either the man himſelf, or ſome other.* The Scripture itſelf gives us the Catholic concluſion; this alteration of the Scripture will admit of the *Arian* concluſion. From St. Paul's compariſon, the Spirit is God himſelf; from this author's, he is *either* God himſelf, or ſome other.

X. In a book lately publiſhed againſt the *Articles of Religion*, under the title of *The Confeſſional*, I have met with a new objection to our way of worſhip; which, as it can deceive none but common readers, I ſhall preſent you with it in this place. "The Athanaſian Creed ſays," as the author of this work obſerves, "that in ALL THINGS the Unity "in Trinity, and the Trinity in Unity is to be worſhipped[3]." Then he aſks, "Is this the caſe in ALL our forms of wor-"ſhip? Turn back to the Litany," (that is, *turn forward*, the Litany ſtands *after* the *Athanaſian* Creed) "and you will "ſee three diſtinct invocations of the three Perſons, to each "of whom the term *God* is aſſigned, implying a ſufficiency "in each, in his *perſonal* capacity, to hear and grant the "petition."

[2] P. 66. [3] Confeſſional, p. 319.

"petition." This, he aſſures you, is a *remarkable* and *notorious deviation* from the *Athanaſian* maxim; and that others might be given *in great abundance.*

By an *Athanaſian*, he means a *Chriſtian* maxim; but calls it *Athanaſian*, that your faith may ſeem to *ſtand in the wiſdom of men:* and our deviation from this maxim is evident to him, from the three diſtinct invocations in the beginning of the Litany. But if you look into the Litany itſelf, you will diſcover, that theſe three invocations are followed by a fourth, addreſſed to the "Holy, bleſſed, and glorious Tri-"nity, three Perſons and ONE GOD." In the three former petitions, the Unity *in Trinity*; in the fourth, the Trinity in *Unity* is worſhipped. But of this fourth he takes no notice; and then accuſes the Church of a *remarkable* and *notorious* deviation from her own maxims; whereas he ought to have taken the *whole* addreſs together, and then have urged his exceptions, if any ſuch could have been reaſonably made againſt it. To take one portion of any form, abſtracted from another which completes it, and then charge his brethren with defects and contradictions of his own making, is agreeable neither to ſound criticiſm, nor indeed to common equity. Such a practice as this will convict even the Scripture itſelf of atheiſm: for if you leave out the words—*The fool hath ſaid in his heart*, there will remain the naked aſſertion—*there is no God.* Or it might be proved from the Goſpel, as I once heard it attempted by an excommunicated infidel, that the Old Teſtament is now to be utterly condemned and laid aſide, becauſe it is ſaid—*Hang all the law and the prophets.* But if the ſentence be taken in that form in which the Scripture hath given it, the ſenſe is entirely altered; and ſo it happens with the objection lately diſcovered by the author of the *Confeſſional.* His brethren, as you have ſeen, accuſe us of believing in *Three Gods*; and he mocks at our worſhip, as if it could be reconciled with no other principle.

XI. But it is ſaid farther, that the doctrine of the Trinity is an *offenſive doctrine*[4], which has *done infinite miſchief* to

[4] P. 66. of the Appeal.

the

the cauſe of Chriſt's religion, and that it is *in vain to expect the converſion of Jews, Mahometans, and Heathens*[s], ſo long as we hold this doctrine neceſſary to ſalvation.

On ſuch occaſions as this, the Goſpel, I fear, will countenance but a very ſmall degree of compliance. In matters indifferent, and for the ſake of thoſe who have not yet broken the bond of peace, and Chriſtian unity, every conceſſion ought to be made that can be made with innocence. But if we once quit our moorings, to launch out into the boundleſs ocean of worldly Policy, miſcalled Moderation, in ſearch of proſelytes, whoſe pride, pleaſure, and merit it is, not to be found and converted, we ſhall be rewarded with ſhame and diſappointment, and ſhall alſo make ſhipwreck of our own faith.

The *Socinians* objected it to us long ago, that the doctrines of the Trinity and Incarnation prevent the converſion of *Mahometans*, *Jews*, and *Pagans*. And the ſame doctrines hinder our *Arians* and *Socinians* too from being converted: the true character of the Chriſtian Saviour, and the true object of Chriſtian worſhip, being ſo eſſential to the Goſpel, that no man is to be accounted a convert, till he agrees with Chriſtians in theſe articles. Were we to alter the Chriſtian faith into what Jews, Turks, and Pagans believe, then we ſhould gain them all; for then we ſhould be agreed; that is, we ſhould ceaſe to be Chriſtians as well as they.

If this reaſoning is of any force in one caſe, it muſt be admitted in others. The Trinity, they ſay, is ſo offenſive to the Turks, that we ſhall never gain them till it is given up. No: nor then neither. For *Mahomet* gave them a liberty of having ſeveral wives; but *Chriſt* hath taught us, that *God in the beginning made them male and female*, and that a Chriſtian muſt have no more wives than *Adam* had. Of this doctrine I may therefore ſay, with as much reaſon as the *Arians* do of the Trinity, that it has *done infinite miſchief*, and that we can *never expect the converſion of Mahometans*, ſo long as it keeps its place in the Goſpel of Chriſt. If an

[s] P. 133. Ibid.

Arian or *Socinian* were to preach in the ſtreets of *Conſtantinople*, inſiſting properly upon this doctrine, he would make no converts: for the Turk will as ſoon be perſuaded to worſhip the Trinity in Unity, or even three different Gods, as ſubmit to have no more than one wife. And this may ſerve to ſhew the weakneſs and abſurdity of ſuch popular arguments; to which, I apprehend, our diſputants againſt the Church would not apply themſelves ſo very often, could they depend ſafely upon better topics. If the preſent faith and worſhip of the Church are againſt the Scripture, that is enough; and we ſhall want no other arguments to perſuade us out of them. But if they are not, I leave you to judge, my friends, whether we ought to forſake them out of civility to the *Turks*, who pray five times a day that they may never become Chriſtians.

But there are *Papiſts* in the world who have ſouls to be ſaved as well as the Turks; and what would they think of us, if we ſhould gratify Jews, Heathens, and Mahometans, by denying the Trinity? They have always been found in the belief of this doctrine; and we could never hope to recover any proſelytes from the errors of Popery; but, on the contrary, ſhould make the religion of Proteſtants more odious than ever, if, under the name of reformation, we were to root up the foundations of the Goſpel. You have heard, perhaps, that they have called us *Heretics* for theſe two hundred years paſt; and very falſely: but if we ſhould abjure the Chriſtian Trinity, we ſhould no longer have the name for nothing; but ſhould be guilty of adding that truth to the accuſation, of which they would not fail to make their advantage. And, laſtly, the far greateſt part of Proteſtants would reject us.

Theſe things being conſidered, we are brought at length to the following iſſue: that to pleaſe ſome, we muſt part with the doctrine of the Trinity; and to pleaſe others, we muſt keep it. Which may ſhew plainly enough what I have had in view from the beginning of this Epiſtle, that merely popular arguments are of no uſe towards ſettling points of ſcriptural doctrine; but it may be turned this way or that,

as the manager finds it moſt convenient. Diſcretion and charity are indeed to be conſulted by every Chriſtian, and on every ſubject; but a writer who has a good cauſe to maintain, and knows where its proper ſtrength lies, will not go out of his way to amuſe people with what is nothing to the purpoſe. Whereas, if a cauſe is not ſo ſtrong as it ſhould be, popular conſiderations ſerve to put the reader into an heat; and when a man's paſſions are up, he will hear no reaſon on one ſide, and requires none on the other.

XII. There is one more of their inſinuations, which is the laſt I ſhall make any remarks upon at preſent; and it is this, *viz.* that "there are ſeveral Clergymen of the Church "of *England*, who groan under the weight of the *Athana-* "*ſian* forms and worſhip, that would be very glad of your "aſſiſtance to be delivered from ſo great a burden upon "their conſciences[6]." For the credit of the Church of England, I hope there are not many ſuch: but if any Clergymen ſhould be ſo miſtaken as to imagine, that a contempt for any of the Chriſtian doctrines is an argument of their ſuperior ſenſe and learning, they are more truly the objects of Pity, than of Envy or Imitation: and your Arian counſellors, who are ſo forward to caution you againſt *human authority*, will give me leave to adviſe you not to depend upon *human example*. An error is ſtill an error though it reſides in a Clergyman; and inſtead of being thereby ſanctified, is only more deformed and dangerous than it was before. A profane oath, or a curſe, would ſound the more horrible, if a Biſhop were to have the uttering of it. A toad is an hideous creature in every ſituation; but is never ſo much abhorred as when it creeps into the beſt room of the houſe. The miniſters of Chriſt are the *ſalt of the earth*: and if this ſalt *have loſt its ſavour, wherewith ſhall it be ſeaſoned?*

The Scripture will teach you, that the worſhip of the Golden Calf was a grievous ſin, though *Aaron*, who was a Clergyman, had the making of it. And there was a time,

[6] Appeal, p. 120.

when the whole body of the Clergy, I mean the Jewiſh, determined Chriſt himſelf to be a blaſphemer and deceiver, and were inſtant with loud voices requiring that he might be crucified.

Thoſe Clergymen, who, like Dr. *Clarke* and his follower, the author of the *Appeal*, do by their own confeſſion believe *two different Gods*, while they falſely accuſe us of believing *Three*, would undoubtedly be very glad to be well rid of a Trinity in Unity; as the Turks were, when they took the religion of *Mahomet* into the place of it. And if they ſhould at length prevail, by dint of popular clamour and importunity, of which ſome wonderful effects have been ſeen in this kingdom, the Turks, and the Jews too, would congratulate them upon their victory; and ſo would every determined Deiſt and Atheiſt in the nation. Yet, after all, none of them would worſhip that imagined inferior Deity, whom this author would perſuade you to worſhip.

I believe it alſo to be very true, that they would, as their advocate tells you, be *very glad of your aſſiſtance*. And I have been conſidering with myſelf in what form and manner your aſſiſtance can be adminiſtered. They can hardly mean, that you ſhould aſſiſt them with the pen, and write books upon *Reformation*; for very few amongſt you are ſcholars: nor with the tongue, for you are no orators. And I know not how you can aſſiſt them otherwiſe, except it be with fire and ſword, as the reformed Clergy were aſſiſted in the laſt century, when loyalty was malignity, and epiſcopacy was anti-chriſtianity, and the moſt miſerable oppreſſion and ſlavery of two thirds of the people, was celebrated as a ſtate of Chriſtian liberty to the prevailing party.

We know but too well, that the Goſpel, with all its doctrines, is an inſupportable *burden* to thoſe who do not believe it: and ſo is the law of the land to thoſe who do not like to be under the reſtraint of it. Some men are fond of liberty in one ſhape, and ſome in another. Some think as they pleaſe; and others act as they pleaſe. This latter ſort of people, many of whom are *groaning under the weight* of political *forms*, would alſo be very glad of your aſſiſtance toward amending

amending the conſtitution, and reſtoring gentlemen to that ſtate of freedom, in which they might follow their conſciences without any danger. And, perhaps, they would not object to your aſſiſtance as unwarrantable in the ſacred cauſe of liberty, though you ſhould accompliſh their purpoſes by pulling the magiſtrate from his chair, the judge from his bench, the two houſes of parliament from their ſeats, and the King from his throne.

Theſe are the proſpects I have before my eyes, when I hear Deiſts and Socinians haranguing the public upon the ſubjects of Conſcience and Impoſition: which proſpects having been once realized in this Church and Kingdom, cannot be deemed altogether chimerical. Such popular reaſonings as I have now been contending with, have already produced the moſt fatal conſequences, to the triumph of the Papiſts, and the ſcandal of the Reformation: they have deceived you once: and unleſs you are upon your guard, they will deceive you again: *and the laſt error ſhall be worſe than the firſt*; worſe in itſelf, and worſe in its conſequences. It pleaſed God to deliver the Church from its captivity under the Puritans, and the people from their infatuation: but if experiments, when they have been tried, leave us no wiſer, or, perhaps, not ſo wiſe as they found us, it is much to be queſtioned whether we ſhall again meet with the like indulgence: at leaſt, it will be ſafeſt always to bear in mind that courſe of divine Providence in a ſimilar inſtance, propoſed as a warning to all Chriſtians by the apoſtle St. *Jude, How that the Lord having ſaved the people out of the land of Egypt, afterwards deſtroyed them that believed not.*

Thoſe authors who would ſtir you up to ſeditious motions, make you ſo many fair ſpeeches, and lay claim to ſo much candor and charity, that you may eaſily miſtake them for your beſt friends. But I muſt now leave you to judge for yourſelves, whether a writer, who lies ſculking in the dark, under a nameleſs title-page, can really love you better than one who is not afraid to ſubſcribe his name at length to what he has written, and is expoſing himſelf for your ſakes to be reviled and perſecuted in the monthly publications of

infidel Critics, who on account of the information I have here given you, with a deſire to clear away ſome of that duſt, which they and their friends are perpetually throwing into your eyes, will find, if poſſible, ſome worſe names for me than they have ever done yet. They have expreſſed their wrath againſt me more than once or twice; and probably they will now do it again. But a little more ill language will do me no harm; and if I can do you any good at ſuch an expence, it will all be chearfully taken by your

Very ſincere Friend,

and moſt affectionate

Brother in Chriſt,

PLUCKLEY,
Dec. 16, 1766.

WILLIAM JONES.

R. E-

REFLEXIONS

ON THE

GROWTH OF HEATHENISM

AMONG

MODERN CHRISTIANS:

IN A

LETTER TO A FRIEND AT OXFORD.

Humbly recommended to the ſerious Conſideration of all thoſe who are entruſted with the EDUCATION of YOUTH.

By a PRESBYTER of the CHURCH of ENGLAND.

REFLEXIONS

ON THE

GROWTH OF INFATHEISM

IN

MODERN CHRISTIANS:

IN A

LETTER TO A FRIEND AT OXFORD.

Humbly inscribed to the Serious Consideration of all those who are troubled with the Inconsistency of DOUBT.

By a DISSENTER of the CHURCH of ENGLAND.

ADVERTISEMENT.

THE Reader may be ſhocked when he is told, that there is a diſpoſition to Heatheniſm in an age of ſo much improvement, and pronounce the accuſation improbable and viſionary; but he is requeſted to weigh impartially the facts here offered, and then to form his judgment. The following Letter was intended only for the inſpection of a friend; but if there is any tendency in the public to ſuch a peculiar kind of corruption, as is here pointed out, they ought to have ſome warning of it; and therefore it has been judged that the preſent publication can be neither impertinent nor unſeaſonable.

The preſent Edition of this Letter, in the year 1794, is more ſeaſonable than the firſt; now we have been witneſs to the profane affectation of Heathen manners by the Philoſophers of France; with its malignant effects on Religion, Government, and the Peace of the Chriſtian world.

R E-

ADVERTISEMENT.

THE Reader may be shocked when he is told, that there is a disposition to Heathenism in an age of so much improvement, and pronounce the accusation improbable and visionary: but he is requested to weigh impartially the facts here offered, and then to form his judgment. The following Letter was intended only for the inspection of a friend; but if there is any tendency in the public to such a peculiar kind of corruption, as is here pointed out, they ought to have some warning of it; and therefore it has been judged that the present publication can be neither impertinent nor unseasonable.

The present Edition of this Letter, in the year 1794, is more seasonable than the first; now we have been witnesses to the profane affectation of Heathen manners by the Philosophers of France; with its malignant effects on Religion, Government, and the Peace of the Christian world.

N E-

REFLEXIONS, &c.

DEAR SIR,

A WORTHY gentleman *, who is a collector of things rare and curious in their ſeveral kinds, ſhewed me a large ſhoeing-horn, which as tradition reports had been the property of an ancient abbot of Glaſtonbury. This relic of antiquity is very handſomely engraved with figures repreſenting the ſeven works of charity; which are, the giving of bread to the hungry, drink to the thirſty, cloaths to the naked, lodging to ſtrangers, viſiting the ſick, and priſoners, and burying the dead. On this my learned friend took occaſion to remark, that in the ages before the Reformation, the ſubjects of the ornamental arts, which are now ſo univerſally taken from the Heathen Mythology, were then generally borrowed from the Holy Scripture, and had ſome pious relation to the doctrines of Chriſtianity. Of this he ſhewed me another remarkable inſtance in the powder-horn of King Henry VIII, which is adorned with the hiſtory of St. Stephen's martyrdom, in elegant figures of ivory. Whereas, had an artiſt of this age been ſet to invent a

* The late Rev. Mr. Goſtling, of Canterbury.

device for a powder-horn, his imagination would immediately have ſuggeſted to him the fall of Phaeton, the Cyclops forging thunderbolts, or ſome like alluſion to the hiſtory and effects of fire from the ſtores of the Heathen Mythology.

I ſhall not ſtop here to diſpute which of theſe two ſources, Paganiſm or Chriſtianity, will furniſh the beſt ſubjects for poets, painters, and ſculptors to work upon: but I cannot help obſerving, that the general ſtate of religion and manners may be judged of by the ſtyle and taſte adopted in the ornamental arts. There might be a faulty ſuperſtition, with a mixture of ſimplicity bordering upon ignorance, in the works of former ages; but the ſtyle of them ſhewed that Chriſtianity was the religion of the country, and that the ſeveral particulars of the ſacred hiſtory were then held in honour, as the ſubjects moſt worthy to be offered for admiration, and recommended by all the efforts of human ingenuity.

This was certainly the perſuaſion of thoſe times: but in the preſent age the public taſte can ſeldom find any thing but Heathen matter to work upon: from which it is natural to infer, that Heatheniſm is in better repute than formerly; and thence it will follow, that the public regard to Chriſtianity, and all that relates to it, is proportionably declined.

Polydore Virgil, in his work *De rerum inventoribus*, tells us how in the middle ages of the church, they chriſtened the ceremonies of the Pagan ſuperſtition, and adapted their fables to the myſteries of the Chriſtian worſhip: which obſervation will undoubtedly account for much of the pomp that appears in the celebrities of the modern church of Rome. There might poſſibly be a very good intention in thus attempting to reclaim what had been miſapplied, in order to make an impreſſion upon vulgar minds in their own way; but there was often great weakneſs and want of judgment in the manner, which ſhould never be propoſed for imitation. Thus much of their humour ought to be retained, that the true religion ſhould, in all places, and on all occaſions, be ſeen to preſerve its ſuperiority over the falſe; not merely becauſe one is better than the other, but

becauſe

becauſe the one is worthy of God, and will raiſe honourable ſentiments in men, while the other was never intended for any thing but an engine of the devil, to infuſe ſentiments of impurity, obſcenity, pride, and vanity, diſhonourable to God, and deſtructive to man. Yet the taſte for Heathen learning, which began to prevail about the times of the Reformation, hath been productive of an evil, which hath been growing upon us for two hundred years paſt, and hath at length given to Heatheniſm the upper hand in almoſt every ſubject. The fabulous objects of the Grecian mythology have even got poſſeſſion of our churches; in one of which * I have ſeen a monument, with elegant figures as large as the life, of the three Fates, Clotho, Lacheſis, and Atropos, ſpinning and clipping the thread of a great man's life: by which ſpecies of memorial, he is taken as it were out of the hands of the true God, whom we Chriſtians worſhip in our churches, and turned over to the miſerable blindneſs of Heathen deſtiny: not to mention the inſult and profanation with which Heathen idols are brought into a Chriſtian temple. In the ſame church, the baptiſtery or font is removed almoſt out of ſight; and when found, has a very mean and unworthy appearance, as if it were intended for ſome other uſe: ſo natural is it for thoſe improvements which exalt Heatheniſm to debaſe Chriſtianity. How conſpicuous are all the temples of the Heathen idols in the famous gardens of Stowe in Buckinghamſhire; while the pariſh church, which happens to ſtand within the precincts, is induſtriouſly ſhrouded behind ever-greens and other trees, as an object impertinent, or at leaſt of no importance to a ſpectator of modern taſte. In our rural ornaments we have temples to all the Pagan divinities; and in the city a Pantheon, wherein there is a general aſſembly of the ſons and daughters of pleaſure, under the auſpices of Heathen dæmons †.

This taſte is not only profane and corrupting whenever it takes place, but the productions of it are ſometimes mon-

* At the village of Wharton, near Kettering, in Northamptonſhire.

† The author of theſe Reflexions hath lived to ſee it deſtroyed by fire.

ſtrouſly abſurd and incongruous: it begets a certain inattention to propriety, which admits of falſe and ſhocking aſſociations, conſiſtent neither with goodneſs of taſte, nor correctneſs of judgment. When I ſee the figure of a cock upon the top of a ſteeple, I am reminded of that ſacred bird who was a monitor to St. Peter, and through his example is now giving a daily leſſon to all believers. When I ſee the globe and croſs on the top of St. Paul's, I rejoice in the exaltation of him who was humbled for our ſakes, but is now the head of all principality and power to the church and to the world; and I feel a ſecret ſatisfaction in reflecting, that a croſs ſo exalted has no reproach in it, as if the offence of it were ceaſed. But when I ſee the dragon upon Bow-ſteeple, I can only wonder how an emblem ſo expreſſive of the devil, and frequently introduced as ſuch into the temples of idolaters, found its way to the ſummit of a Chriſtian edifice. I am ſo jealous in theſe matters, that I muſt confeſs myſelf to have been much hurt by a like impropriety in a well-known muſic-room, where there is an organ conſecrated by a ſuperſcription to Apollo, although the praiſes of Jehovah are generally celebrated by it once every month in the choral performances: and it ſeems rather hard that Jehovah ſhould condeſcend to be a borrower, while Apollo is the proprietor.

In all the ſciences the tokens of this Pagan infection are very obſervable. In politics we hear of nothing but Brutus, and are ſtunned with the heroiſm of rebels, and the virtue of regicides. In morality, how venerable are the characters of Socrates, and Cato the ſuicide: while the Spartan virtue is become the grand object of patriotic emulation; though I am ſure it would make a ſhocking figure if the moral character of that commonwealth were impartially repreſented on the authority of Plutarch. Botany, which in ancient times was full of the bleſſed Virgin Mary, and had many religious memorials affixed to it, is now as full of the Heathen Venus, the Mary of our modern virtuoſi. Amongſt the ancient names of plants, we find the Calceolus Mariæ, Carduus Mariæ, Carduus benedictus, our Lady's Slipper, our Lady's Thiſtle, our Lady's Mantle, the Alchymilla,

milla, &c. but modern improvements have introduced the Speculum Veneris, Labrum Veneris, Venus's Looking-glaſs, Venus's Baſin (the Dipſacus), Venus's Navel-wort, Venus's Fly-trap, and ſuch-like: and whereas the ancient botaniſts took a pleaſure in honouring the memory of the Chriſtian ſaints with their St. John's wort, St. Peter's wort, herb Gerard, herb Chriſtopher, and many others; the modern ones, more affected to their own honour, have dedicated ſeveral newly-diſcovered genera of plants to one another; of which the Hottonia, the Sibthorpia, are inſtances, with others ſo numerous and familiar to men of ſcience, that they need not be ſpecified.

But in poetry, the ſervility of Chriſtians is moſt notorious of all. Here they follow as implicitly as if the Heathen Muſes had deprived them of their wits. If any machinery is to be introduced, it muſt all be according to the Heathen model, by a law as invariable as that of the Medes and Perſians. But it ſhould be conſidered, that when an Heathen poet made uſe of his divine machinery, he only ſpoke as he believed, introducing ſuch powers into his verſe as he profeſſed to worſhip in proſe. After he had been offering ſacrifices in the temple of Minerva, it was natural for him to bring her in to the aſſiſtance of his hero: but when a Chriſtian moraliſt does the ſame, propoſing a pattern of virtue on the Heathen plan for the purpoſes of education, he goes out of his way, to adopt what he knows to be as abſurd in itſelf as it is contrary to his profeſſion. If there is a natural oppoſition between truth and falſhood, we are now as irrational in betraying a partiality to the profane objects of Heatheniſm, as the Heathens themſelves would have been, had they ſhewn the like regard to the ſacred objects of the Bible; only with this difference, that they would have taken up what was better than their own, whereas we incline to that which is worſe: their choice would have brought them nearer to God; ours brings us nearer to the Devil. How ſtrange would it have been, if while their temples were dedicated to Venus, Mars, and Bacchus, their gardens had been adorned with ſtatues of Moſes and Aaron, the walls

of their houſes painted with the deſtruction of Sodom, the overthrow of Pharaoh, the delivery of the two tables on Mount Sinai, and ſuch like ſubjects of ſacred hiſtory! Who would not have inferred in ſuch a caſe, that their temples were frequented out of form, while their inclinations were toward the law of Moſes, and the God of the Hebrews? The Heathen prieſts would never have been ſilent on ſuch an occaſion: they would have exclaimed againſt this double-faced diſaffection, and have given the alarm againſt all that were guilty of it, as perſons ready to apoſtatize from the religion of their anceſtors. But alas! no Heathens were ever found to be thus inconſiſtent: they were faithful to their profeſſion, and with one mind abominated every thing that was Jewiſh, for the relation it bore to the Jewiſh worſhip; always railing againſt that nation as low and contemptible, and their religion as fooliſh and ſuperſtitious. We alſo ſhould be as ſincere in our profeſſion as they were in theirs, and ſhould expreſs our averſion againſt folly and profaneneſs wherever they occur, unleſs our intellects were vitiated with falſe wiſdom from the common forms of education. To take little things for great, and great for little, is the worſt misfortune that can befal the human underſtanding. The machinery of Heatheniſm appears great to ſcholars, becauſe it has been deſcribed by great wits of antiquity, with great words and muſical verſes; and being offered very early to the mind at ſchool, there is a natural prepoſſeſſion in favour of it. But is there really any thing great in the character of Æolus, ſhutting up the winds in a den? In Vulcan the blackſmith, hammering thunderbolts with his one-eyed journeymen? In Neptune, a man living under water like a fiſh, and flouriſhing a pitch-fork to ſtill the raging of the ſea? If theſe things are taken literally, according to that poetical character in which the ancient writers uſed them, and in which only they are adopted by the moderns, they are ſo mean and ridiculous, that when the Heathens were preſſed with them after the commencement of the Goſpel, they could find no way of upholding their dignity, but by reſolving them into their phyſical character;

racter; that is, by accommodating them to the powers and operations of nature, to which they alluded with a ſort of myſtical reſemblance *.

Notwithſtanding all this, ſuch is the attachment to the Heathen models, that Boileau lays it down as a principle in epic poetry, that no grandeur of deſcription can be attained without introducing Jupiter, Juno, Pallas, Neptune, with the whole tribe of Pagan divinities: and if any Chriſtian ſhould be deterred by a ſenſe of his profeſſion from making uſe of theſe *ancient ornaments*, as he calls them, his ſcruples can be aſcribed to nothing but a vain and ſuperſtitious fear. And indeed our poets have generally aſſented to this doctrine of Boileau, without finding themſelves much embarraſſed by the terrors of Chriſtian ſuperſtition; inſomuch that if any ſtranger were to judge of our religion from the practice of our poets and tragedians, he would take Paganiſm for the eſtabliſhed religion of the country. For beſides hymns to Venus and Bacchus, and Wood Nymphs, and Water Nymphs †, we ſee virtues and attributes imperſonated and deified as they were of old: we have odes to Liberty, odes to Health, odes to Contentment; in which Health is prayed to for health, and Contentment is entreated to give contentment, that is, to be the cauſe of itſelf; with many other abſurdities, in which the licence of poetry is not very conſiſtent with common ſenſe, and much leſs with the ſenſe of religion.

What is more common with poets than to make a compliment of the creation to Jupiter? and conſequently of all thoſe ſovereign attributes of power, wiſdom, and goodneſs, which are diſplayed in the works of nature; eſpecially in the formation of the human ſpecies? Of this we have a ſpecimen in the following lines by the late celebrated Dean of St. Patrick's.

* This is done at large by Phurnatus, in his book Περι Θεων φυσεως, publiſhed in Gale's Opuſcula Mythologica.

† The laſt thing that occurred to me of this kind, was, a prayer of poor Phyllis Wheatley, the negro poeteſs, to Neptune, entreating his providence to preſerve her friend in a voyage.

When Cupid did his grandſire Jove entreat
To form ſome beauty by a new receipt:
* * * * * *
Jove mixt up all, and his beſt clay employ'd,
Then call'd the happy compoſition Floyd.

If a Latin poet celebrates the nativity and genius of ſome learned men, Lucina preſides at his birth, and brings him ſafely into the world; the Muſes are his nurſes, Minerva teaches him, and Phœbus inſpires him. When his death is to be lamented, what can his ſurviving friend ſay for him, on poetical principles, but wiſh himſelf Orpheus, that ſo with his lyre he might go down to hell, and prevail on Pluto (the keeper of all dead Chriſtians *) to reſtore him back again? This is the poor trite ſtuff, which hath now been repeated for ſome ages paſt: the Heathen Deities have been the objects of poetical gratitude, and the Heathen fables the ſources of poetical conſolation! Such poets muſt excuſe me, if I remind them of their error in words like thoſe of the Apoſtle; "O fooliſh Chriſtians, who hath bewitched you, that ye ſhould return to theſe beggarly elements, before whom Jeſus Chriſt hath been ſet forth, as alive from the dead? Having begun in Chriſtianity, are ye to be made perfect by Heatheniſm? Have ye ſuffered ſo many perſecutions, and are ye now going back to thoſe idols, for whoſe ſakes ye were appointed as ſheep to the ſlaughter? The folly which returned from the freedom of the Goſpel back to the bondage of the law, was nothing when compared to that which trifles with Omnipotence, and gives to idols and devils the honour due only to the true God."

* The public has been informed, that a proceſſion after the mode of the Heathen funeral rites, was lately celebrated with great pomp, inſtead of Chriſtian burial: in which proceſſion, the heart of a dead Chriſtian was carried through the Elyſian Fields to ſoft muſic, and placed with proper ſolemnity in a very conſpicuous Mauſoleum. Some years ago, a Bacchanalian feſtival was celebrated, and ſacred rites performed before the idol of Bacchus, at the ſame place; the particulars of which are preſerved in ſome public prints of that time.

For the origin of poetry, Boileau, the French critic, can go no higher than to the Heathen Oracles:

" Theſe miracles from numbers did ariſe,
Since which in verſe heaven taught his myſteries;
And by a prieſt poſſeſs'd with rage divine,
Apollo ſpoke from his prophetic ſhrine."

Dryden's Tranſl.

How ſerious is this! One would think Apollo had written the Bible; or at leaſt that the oracular verſes of Heathen diviners were prior to the ſacred ſongs of the Scripture, and of equal authority. But when great wits are tranſported into the fabulous regions of poetry, they become inſenſible of the wickedneſs of diabolical impoſture (for ſuch was the practice at the ſhrines of Apollo) and forget what they owe to truth, reaſon, and revelation.

I think Milton hath made it appear, that what is great in poetry may well be attained without borrowing any thing from the ancient ornaments of the Pagan machinery: and indeed his poem of Paradiſe Loſt never ſinks below itſelf more effectually, than when he condeſcends to treat his ſubject in the Heathen phraſe, and embelliſh it with Heathen alluſions, as where Adam and Eve are compared to Jupiter and Juno *; which is ſo foreign and unnatural, that the imagination being ſhocked with the impropriety, becomes incredulous, and then the pleaſure of reading is loſt. Perhaps it may be imputed to the formality of Puritaniſm, that his poem was not ſtill more deformed with the impertinent ornaments of profane literature. In that age, the religion and morality of the claſſical writers, had not obtained quite ſo much authority as afterwards, when they were called in to give their ſanction to hereſy, and to corrupt the higheſt myſteries of the Chriſtian faith. Then was the pernicious example of Cato ſet up, who hath been followed ever ſince as a pattern of ſuicide, becauſe the ſin was unfortunately varniſhed over by the ſentiments and diction of that elegant

* Book iv. 499.

ſcholar Mr. Addiſon; who ſpoke of "treading on claſſical ground" with that veneration, with which the palmers and pilgrims of the twelfth century viſited the Holy Land, which had been the ſcene of our bleſſed Saviour's miracles.

Who does not know, that Heathen fragments are now ſought after as zealouſly as Chriſtian relics were collected in former ages? There was a time when all the curious people of this nation were alarmed and animated if the bones of ſome ancient hermit were found, or ſome treatiſe recovered and added to the works of a legendary writer. Now the like alarm is ſpread, if an Etruſcan vault is opened, and ſome old broken pitchers are brought to light, with groteſque ill-deſigned figures upon them. When ſome great men, famous for their parts and learning, have diſtinguiſhed themſelves by a taſte for Heathen principles and Heathen curioſities, the whole tribe of inferiors follows them of courſe, as the vulgar on all other occaſions ſubmit readily to faſhion; the common rule of thoſe who have no judgment. That the ſtudy of antiquity is not entertaining and curious, I do not mean to ſay; neither would I ſuggeſt that it is without its uſe; for certainly it is both uſeful and reputable to know many things which it is not neceſſary to admire: but ſome minds are ſo ill prepared to make proper diſtinctions, that their curioſity riſes inſenſibly to a religious veneration, too often attended with a diſaffection toward every thing that relates to the Chriſtian character.

It is much to be lamented, that while we are learning from the ſcholars of profane antiquity, the beauties of imagery, the graces of diction, the arts of oratory, and the harmony of poetry, we are not better upon our guard againſt their principles, which ſteal upon us through the vehicles of poetry and oratory, till our taſte is wholly vitiated, and the glorious realities of the Chriſtian revelation become inſipid and inſignificant.

Experience ſhews how difficult it is to dwell with delight upon the expreſſions of Heathen writers, without embracing too many of their ſentiments. When a painter hath exhibited Thaïs with all her charms, he that values the lines

of

of the picture, and admires the ſkill of the maſter, may very poſſibly be tempted to luſt after the original, though he is apprized before-hand that ſhe is an infamous and abandoned ſtrumpet.

Dr. Middleton confeſſes in one of his letters, that his claſſical engagements had rendered him very ſqueamiſh in his theological ſtudies; and I am well convinced this has been the caſe with many others, who from having their brains filled with Heathen notions, and their affections touched with the vanity of conſcious erudition, have contracted a nauſea toward the Bible and its contents; firſt diſreliſhing, and at length deliberately oppoſing, the Chriſtian doctrines; perhaps without being ſenſible how their minds were originally debauched. If this experiment is fatal in ſo many inſtances, and dangerous in all, it is an alarming conſideration, that the firſt ideas conceived by ſchool-boys are for the moſt part of the Heathen ſtamp: and I fear they are too ſeldom inſtructed in due ſeaſon concerning the infinite difference between the true God and the falſe *. I was told once by a ſchool-boy, that one of his companions aſked him very ſeriouſly, which was the uppermoſt, Jupiter or God Almighty? And well might the poor child be ignorant of the diſtinction, when his elders, who ought to have had more judgment, have made ſome foul miſtakes in the ſame way; ſuch as that in the Univerſal Prayer of Mr. Pope, which gives us a new ſort of levelling Theology, unknown to the wiſdom of former ages. When the Jewiſh nation was called out by the prophet Elijah to be ſpectators of the grandeſt diſpute the world ever ſaw, that is, to determine whether Jehovah or Baal was the proper object of religious adoration, Mr. Pope could have ſettled it all in a word or two, only by inſtructing the parties that the true God is worſhipped in every climate by thoſe who worſhip any God at all: that the Saint, the Savage, and the Sage, the Hebrew,

* This caution hath been laudably obſerved by the judicious editor of the *Selectæ e profanis Scriptoribus Hiſtoriæ*, who hath prefaced his collection with ſuch admonitions and diſtinctions as would render the preſent ſtrictures ſuperfluous, if they were more generally attended to.

the Hottentot, and the Greek philoſopher, were the votaries of one and the ſame Divinity. How miſtaken were the poor Chriſtians under all the Roman perſecutions, in throwing away their lives upon a diſtinction which had no exiſtence! They were brought before the altar of Jupiter, and the uſual alternative was propoſed, either to ſuffer death or ſignify their adoration. Had either party been aware of the new levelling principle, they might have been reconciled without proceeding to theſe extremities, and have joined amicably in the ſame ſacrifices. Thus much however we may conclude for certain, that if the poet had been in the like circumſtances, he could not poſſibly have been a martyr, if he believed his own doctrine.

The pious and excellent author of the Night Thoughts, who writes as a Chriſtian moraliſt, hath been tempted by the force of cuſtom to tranſgreſs that rule of ſound criticiſm, which obliges us to make every compoſition uniform and of a piece. What occaſion had he thus to adopt the Heathen ſtyle "that more than miracle the *Gods* indulge *." Why gods in the plural? Why muſt they have the honour of working miracles? And why are the Holy Angels of God, and the red-faced Bacchus of Paganiſm, brought together into the ſame poem? Which, to ſay nothing of the impiety of it, can never be reconciled to the rules of propriety and good writing. If we write as Chriſtians, let us keep up to the ſtyle of our profeſſion: if our ſcene is laid upon Heathen ground, then let us take the language of the Heathen writers—*Sit quod vis ſimplex duntaxat & unum.* The Levitical law forbad the people to plough with an ox and an aſs together; and the New Teſtament taking up the ſame principle, commands us not to be unequally yoked together with unbelievers. All I contend for here is conſiſtency and propriety; and I am ſure the judgment of the beſt critics will bear me out in what I have ſaid.

The caſe of the primitive martyrs, who choſe rather to die than do honour to the Heathen Deities, brings to my remembrance a circumſtance which leſſens my admiration

* Night IId.

of

of those antique statues, which, as the productions of genius, are otherwise very much to be admired for elegance of design and truth of proportion. In times of persecution it was the custom with the bigots of Heathenism to drag the Christians up to the images of their idol-gods, either to offer sacrifice or be put to death: whence it is by no means improbable, that the blood of many innocent Christians may have been barbarously shed to the honour of some statues now in high esteem with modern virtuosi of the same Christian profession; who, for a little excellence of workmanship, admire and respect what their purer predecessors had reason to regard with horror and detestation *.

Where at last will this taste, which hath been prevailing and increasing for so many years, from the days of lord Herbert to the late erection of the Pantheon, where, I say, will it lead us? Where can it lead us, but to indifference and atheism? A Christian corrupted with Heathen affections, degenerates into something worse than the original Heathens of antiquity. They had great faith in such gods as they knew; depended upon them devoutly; and applied to them on every public occasion, either of deprecation or thanksgiving. If we except the Epicureans, they insisted almost universally on a special providence, directing things *pro re natâ*; and were assured that the gods were the avengers of perjury and impiety. But faith in the divine protection, and fear of divine vengeance, are but coldly regarded, and rarely to be met with in many of their modern disciples. Sacrifice was practised by them, as the essential part of religion, for the expiation of private or national guilt: but when the Christian sacrifice is neglected, and the Heathen sacrifices are exploded, nothing remains but a religion with-

* We have heard it observed, that the Statues of Heathen Deities have been generally found under the earth with their faces downward: which renders it probable, that after the conversion of the empire, such Statues had been purposely buried out of the way by the zeal and piety of the primitive Christians. How surprisingly are times altered! We now hear Mr. Gibbon blaming Christians, for not intermixing the *elegant* and *innocent* rites of Paganism with their own worship!

out

out expiation; a thing which never exiſted ſince the expulſion of Adam from Paradiſe, till it was begotten of late times in Socinus, and his followers; when Chriſtian lukewarmneſs engendered with the pride and ignorance of gentile philoſophy.

While we have been conſidering the caſe of poets, orators, and artiſts, how they all ſtand affected to Heatheniſm; I had almoſt forgotten the philoſophers, I mean the natural philoſophers, whoſe ſcience for an hundred years paſt, hath been claiming kindred with the Heathen divinity. About the year 1680, it was obſerved by an eminent ſcholar of that time, that the exact and ſcrutinizing ſpirit of the ſchool-divinity was become neceſſary, in order to detect the pretenſions of ſome "who were ready by the ſtudy of nature to immerſe God in matter, and with thoſe impieties of Democritus and Epicurus, to confound him with nature." In the year 1685, Mr. Boyle, in a treatiſe intitled, "A free Inquiry into the vulgarly received notion of Nature," expreſſed an apprehenſion that the ſame doctrine was likely to gain ground amongſt us; and he gave the alarm to the public in the following emphatic language, which merits well to be conſidered. "Nor are Chriſtians themſelves ſo much out of danger of being ſeduced by theſe Heatheniſh notions about an intelligent world (the ſtoical *anima mundi*,) but that even in theſe times there is lately ſprung up a ſect of men, as well profeſſing Chriſtianity as pretending to philoſophy; who, (if I be not miſinformed of their doctrine) do very much ſymbolize with the ancient Heathens, and talk much indeed of God, but mean ſuch a one as is not really diſtinct from the animated and intelligent univerſe; but is on that account very differing from the true God whom we Chriſtians believe and worſhip. And though I find the leaders of this ſect to be looked upon by ſome more witty than knowing men, as the diſcoverers of unheard-of myſteries in phyſics and natural theology, yet their hypotheſis does not at all appear to me to be new, &c." Then he proceeds to ſhew, that this philoſophical God, which is not eſſentially different from Nature was the Deity of the Heathen

Heathen philoſophers, citing ſuch paſſages as that of Seneca, *Nihil natura ſine Deo eſt, nec Deus ſine natura, ſed* IDEM *eſt uterque.*

How near the expreſſions of our Doctor Halley approach to an avowal of this Heathen opinion in his eulogium on the Newtonian philoſophy, let any impartial perſon judge, when he has conſidered the ſenſe of them. And here let me obſerve by the way, that it is to no purpoſe for any man to tell us that theſe things are popular, and muſt not be ſpoken againſt: they ought to be ſpoken againſt for that very reaſon; becauſe the whole world does not afford a greater temptation to error than long eſtabliſhed popularity; on which conſideration, all men who wiſh to chain down others to their own favourite errors, are for ever ringing this popularity in their ears. To go on therefore with Doctor Halley, whoſe ſentiments concerning God and Nature, are communicated in the following lines:

En tibi norma poli, & divæ libramina Molis,
Computus en Jovis, et quas dum primordia rerum
Conderet, omnipotens ſibi leges ipſe Creator
Dixerit———

Here the *Moles*, or maſs of matter which conſtitutes the world, has the epithet *diva* aſcribed to it, which makes it divine: and in another part of the ſame poem the epithet is given to Nature,

———*jamque abdita* DIÆ
Clauſtra patent NATURÆ———

Then the *computus Jovis*, or calculation of Jupiter, ſuppoſing it to allude to the motions of the heavenly bodies, muſt imply that the viſible world is Jupiter, as it ſtands in the Heathen poet—*Jupiter eſt quodcunque vides:* and this ſeems farther evident from the ſentiment which is explanatory of it, viz. that the Creator (ſuppoſing Jupiter to be he) gave laws to himſelf; which is true if God and Nature are the ſame thing; becauſe in that caſe the laws given to *Nature*, will be laws impoſed upon *God*. The Pſalmiſt, who

who diſtinguiſhes rightly between the works and the work-maſter, ſays, "he gave *them* a law which ſhall not be "broken:" and Mr. Boyle, in his treatiſe above referred to, hath well remarked, that "God when he made the world, and eſtabliſhed the laws of motion, gave them to Matter, and not to himſelf *;" as if he had been cenſuring that expreſſion of Dr. Halley, which has been the ſubject of our preſent animadverſion.

If any other philoſophers have been betrayed by the authority of great names, into the belief of this ſtrange doctrine, it cannot be wondered at, if ſuch are found but badly diſpoſed for the reception of the Chriſtian myſteries; for what concord hath the Heathen Jupiter with the Chriſtian Trinity? What arguments can be ſtrong enough to perſuade thoſe men of a divine co-equal perſonality in the Godhead, who have relapſed into the reveries of Stoiciſm, and are the votaries of an *anima mundi*, an intelligent univerſe, a Deity immerſed in matter? To ſuch, the notion of a co-eternal Son of God, Creator of all things that exiſt, and who ſhall be ſtill the ſame when nature ſhall wax old, and the heavens ſhall vaniſh away, muſt of neceſſity be contemptible and incredible: and this I apprehend to be one reaſon why we have ſo many Arians among the profeſſed admirers of natural philoſophy, thus falſely underſtood.

Let it not be ſaid that I take any pleaſure in cenſuring: a captious cenſor is an odious character. If the queſtion ſhould be put to me, "who made thee a ruler and a judge?" I am ready to anſwer for myſelf, that I ſhall never wiſh to rule where ſo few are inclined to obey; and that I ſhall never judge where my duty will permit me to excuſe. I ſee my country haſting to ruin on many different principles; and I point out one of them, which is the moſt pernicious of all, if it is not in fact the mother of all the reſt. I only ſay what muſt be ſaid by ſomebody, if we are ever to be reclaimed from the perilous conſequences of Pagan corruption: if not, *liberavi animam meam*. Should any perſon aſk me how Chriſtianity is to be baniſhed out of Chriſten-

* Edit. 1685--6. p. 158.

dom,

dom, as the predictions of the Goſpel give us reaſon to expect it will be, I ſhould make no ſcruple to anſwer, that it will certainly be brought to paſs by this growing affection to Heatheniſm *. And therefore it is devoutly to be wiſhed that ſome cenſor would ariſe with the zeal and ſpirit of Martin Luther, to remonſtrate effectually againſt this indulgence of Paganiſm, which is more fatal to the intereſts of Chriſtianity than all the abuſes purged away at the Reformation. This is now the grand abuſe, againſt which the zeal of a Luther, and the wit of an Eraſmus, ought to be directed: it is the abomination of deſolation ſtanding where it ought not, even in the ſanctuary of Chriſtianity, and is a worſe offence than all the profanations that ever happened to the Jewiſh temple. In the mean time, till the world ſhall be bleſſed with ſuch a monitor, I have preſumed to claim ſome freedom of thought, and liberty of ſpeech, againſt the tyranny of prevailing faſhion: and you will pardon me if I confeſs to you, upon this occaſion, the mean opinion I have long entertained of ſome modern refinements; inſomuch that I could wiſh many of them were exchanged for a little of that religious ſimplicity, which placed the ſeven works of charity upon the ſhoeing horn of the Abbot of *Glaſtonbury*.

I am, dear Sir,

Your's, moſt faithfully,

and affectionately.

N. B. An Abbot of Glaſtonbury was hanged at the place, for denying the ſupremacy of Henry VIII. when his effects were confiſcated; and perhaps this article might have been found amongſt them.

* Is not this conjecture of the Author, in the year 1776, now confirmed, by what hath lately happened in France?

AN

ABRIDGMENT

OF THE

AURIFODINA OF DREXELIUS.

By GEORGE HORNE, D.D.

LATE BISHOP OF NORWICH.

AN

ABRIDGMENT, &c.

THIS is an excellent tract on the neceſſity of taking notes in writing, in order to profit by what we read; and the manner of doing it is preſcribed.

The memory is unfaithful, and the beſt memory cannot retain all. *Auguſtin* complained of the many things he had ſuffered himſelf to loſe, and was obliged to ſeek after them again. Much time is loſt in this way. Inſtances are given of learned men endued with great memory, who yet all aſſiſted themſelves by making collections—*ergo notandum et excerpendum.*

Pliny Secundus, the ſecretary of nature, attained to prodigious erudition by this method, which he obſerved conſtantly; inſomuch that his nephew tells us, he never read any thing without making extracts. While he was lying in the ſunſhine; at ſupper; after ſupper; while he was bathing; while he was dreſſing, *liber legebatur, adnotabatur.* Even while he was on a journey, an amanuenſis was with him; who wrote in gloves if the weather was cold: while his nephew was walking out for the air, he uſed that memorable expreſſion, *poteras has horas non perdere—O temporis parſimoniam, quàm ignota es et rara!—Omnium rerum jactura reparabilis, præterquam temporis.*

Extracts are neceſſary, even to a poet, who works from his imagination. We ſee an example of this in Herman Hugo, whoſe *Pia Deſideria* are an ingenious contexture of the Scriptures and the Fathers together; out of which, when

he had collected, he made this excellent uſe. Extracts are the life and ſoul of *hiſtory*; and no hiſtory can be compoſed without previous notation. Even orators muſt read, and note, and transfer the excellencies of others into their own page. Which of them all did ever arrive at the ſummit of learning, without conſtant application to notes and extracts? Ariſtotle exceeded all that went before him; but not without the making of infinite collections from the books they had left behind them. Among great divines, examples are given of *Auguſtin*, *Jerom*, *Cyprian*, and *Bernard*; and after every one, *Drexelius* preſſes the inference, that nothing great ever was, or ever will be done, without induſtrious notation. At laſt he adds an example from his own experience, and proteſts, that he would not part with his notes for any price but that of heaven itſelf. In diſplaying the profit of it, he obſerves, 1. That whatever ſubject was propoſed, he could tell all the authors that had written upon it; even though the ſubject were minute and out of the way. A friend wanted to borrow his book: but moſt authors are of uſe only to thoſe that have read them. He reckons a man nothing, if he could not talk an hour upon a ſubject. 2. In preaching: If the Scriptures were duly read and extracted, a man's ſtore would never be exhauſted. 3. For inſtructing any perſon who comes to conſult or aſk. Particulars of time and place can rarely be recollected without notes. 4. A man may ſubſiſt upon his own ſtock, in caſe of ſickneſs, or under any hindrance, or in time of age, when he muſt write, but cannot read. It is miſerable to be running to the baker, when we ſhould be going to dinner: think of the ant and the bee. The author declares of himſelf, with advantage and ſatisfaction he uſed the fruits of thirty years labour, and that, if his life were to laſt ever ſo long, his fund would never be out. He was a great example of his own doctrine. 5. In all kinds of ſpeaking and writing, he found himſelf in readineſs: and could engage to write two books in a year on different ſubjects out of his *excerpta*. There is little difficulty in building, when all the neceſſary materials are ready at hand. 6. It is of excellent uſe in

converſation; keeps it from flagging, and places us above the neceſſity of vain repetitions, ſuch as women and ignorant perſons fall into for want of matter.

After the doctrine has been confirmed by teſtimonies and examples, the author conſiders the *reaſons*. 1. It is obſerved, that the attention is fixed better by writing and noting, than by repeated readings. Dionyſius of Halicarnaſſus reports, that Demoſthenes tranſcribed Thucydides eight times. Jerom wrote over many volumes. 2. The matter is deeper impreſſed upon the mind. In reading, the eye wanders, and the judgment is leſs exact. Money is not examined merely by looking at it: we rub it, and weigh it, and ſound it, to diſtinguiſh between the precious and the vile: and by a ſimilar method we muſt diſtinguiſh truth from error, and one ſtyle from another. 3. What is written is not forgotten—*litera ſcripta manet*—as it was ſaid in a former chapter. 4. How many volumes for the benefit of the public, have been ſent abroad from the mere induſtry of collecting! *Antiquæ lectiones, Florilegia, Itoræ ſubſecivæ, Muſarum horti, &c. &c.* And if we find the collections of others ſo ſerviceable, how much more ſo will our own be? When we ourſelves are the collectors, our own uſes and purpoſes are provided for; and we may derive more uſe from one page of this ſort, than from a hundred by another perſon, who works according to his own views, not according to yours; as every ſcholar will diſcover, who has any exerciſe in this way: he takes only what ſuits him; turning and twiſting every ſtream into his own channel. (This teaches how we are expoſed when another perſon picks out an hiſtory for us.) 5. The ant collects in ſummer for her food in winter. This is beautifully deſcribed and applied—*itionibus ac reditionibus eandem viam relegit millies, fatigari neſcia—brumæ injurias non metuit, infœcundam hiemem non ægre tolerat*, &c. The happy induſtry of the bee is deſcribed with the ſame poetical elegance—*Omnes apiculæ flores delibant, et velut judicio excerpunt—violarum ſuaves divitias—nec extrahunt niſi quod melioris ſucci eſt; cæterum quod in flore deterius, arvalis relinquunt. Hæc apum ſedulitas, et in excer-*

pendo ſtudiûm, mellis et ceræ theſauris orbem opulentat. Let us be as wiſe as they in our ſtudies: let us take the beſt authors, and out of them the beſt things: otherwiſe, like ſummer flies, we have neither honey nor wax; our converſation and writings are poor and empty. 6. Notes form an epitome, and contain the eſſence of a library, and will ſupply the place of it: they will travel with us, where books are difficult to be met with. Take what you want out of the book you are reading, and it is done for ever: you need never turn it over any more. Incredible how uſeful a volume may be compiled in how ſhort a time! Your own papers will always be found your beſt library.

Objections anſwered.—1. I have no deſign to write volumes like Origen. *A.* But the ſmalleſt thing cannot be well done without it—hence we have ſo many *jejune* compoſitions—and when any public exerciſe comes in courſe, not having dug, we are forced to beg and borrow.——2. Another objection: that perſons who write, neglect the uſe of memory, and ſo loſe it. *A.* This is not to ſet aſide, but to aſſiſt, the memory; and keeps it in exerciſe; for, after all, you muſt remember when, where, what you have noted. Aſſiſtance your memory muſt have, unleſs it is univerſal, and you can carry off by heart the books of a library.——3. Many, and they not unlearned, do not practiſe this method. *A.* Make not thoſe your example who turn out of the ſtrait road, but follow thoſe who are in it. They who do as well as they can without theſe helps, would do much better with them.——4. The old philoſophers delivered to their ſcholars by ear and memory. *A.* But they wrote afterwards at home. The practice of all univerſities is an anſwer to this, where they write down notes of the lectures given to them.——5. You may loſe your notes, and then what becomes of your learning? *A.* What if the ſky ſhould fall? Do men avoid laying up money, for fear the thieves ſhould have it? or to build houſes, for fear they ſhould be burned? And ſuppoſe I ſhould loſe my papers, I may at the worſt have more left upon my mind, than you who never wrote at all.——6. It will be troubleſome to carry

them about. *A.* If they are collected with judgment, according to the method I teach, they will never rise to a great bulk: besides, you, who are so afraid of being overburthened, consider how many articles were carried from place to place by every Roman soldier—*cibum, utensilia, vallum, arma*—and is not learning a sort of warfare?——7. It is a work of too much time. *A.* Your time cannot be better employed: and to some persons, all the time they spend in reading without it, is thrown away. Marking the book, as some people do, is a slovenly trick, and of little use.——8. There are indexes. *A.* Into which you will often look without obtaining any satisfaction—They promise great things, and often do little—Authors seldom make them for themselves—Many books have none—No index so good as our own, taken with the reading of the *context*—It is too late to consult indexes when you are to write or speak: and besides, it is part of the use of your own notes to direct you what books to consult, and what indexes to go to. Idleness is at the bottom of all these excuses: you read for ease and pleasure, not for profit; your reading is of no value—It is not worth while to build a granary to lay up chaff. There is no more benefit in reading a great deal, than in eating a great deal; the good is from what is properly digested. The work may have its trouble; but nothing valuable is obtained without it. Many of moderate parts become great by the practice of noting. That is properly your own, which is the result of your own observation: and nobody can tell, but by experience, the pleasure with which such a work is surveyed, both in its growth, and when it is finished. The scholar enters into his labours, as the bee into its hive.

PART II.

The rules by which our practice is to be guided, are these following.

1. To enter upon the work *early in life:* the sooner we begin, the more we shall collect: musicians begin their

notes when they are children; but better late than never. 2. To do it *with judgment*. The great queſtion is, what to take, and what to leave; and the beſt way of ſettling it, is to lay in good principles of truth, (happy are they, thrice happy, that find them) and to propoſe ſome ſcope, ſome objects, at which we aim more particularly. 3. To do it *continually*—the pen ſhould be always in hand—no book ſo bad, ſaid Pliny, but ſome good to be found in it; and ſo obſerves our Mr. Herbert, where he treats of a parſon's knowledge. Practice makes all things eaſy, and ſkill will come with uſe—read no book *quin excerpas*. 4. Extracts ſhould conſiſt not of common, but of ſelect things. 5. At times review and read over what you have written: no greater pleaſure: a man ſurveys his labours as he does the garden which he has planted, and ſees how plants flouriſh in their proper borders. There is great profit in this, becauſe it tranſplants things from the book to the memory. 5. Always keep in view the end of your own ſtudies—The philologiſt fixes on one thing, the orator on another, the phyſician on another, &c. and the theologian on ſomething different from them all. He will be thinking of the *places*, the *people*, the *times*, the *vices*, *errors*, &c. with which he is concerned; if an improvement occurs, he will note it, as a thing ſuggeſted by the note he is taking.

The method. Every thing that is done well, muſt be done in ſome order. It was the method of Drexelius to divide all his collections into three claſſes, which he called *Lemmata*, *Adverſaria*, *Hiſtorica*: of theſe he had one title for *ſacred*, another for *profane*; ſo in all he had ſix ſortments. The firſt comprehended what related to virtues and vices, and ſubjects of converſation in common life; the ſecond, wiſe ſayings and notable things, ancient rites and cuſtoms. The third, examples at large from hiſtory. Theſe were all referred to in three alphabetical indexes. Every perſon may chuſe his own method, with a good index accommodated. When Drexelius was aſked by his friend Fauſtinus, how he could do ſo much as he had done? He anſwered, the year has 365 days, or 8460 hours: in ſo many

many hours great things may be done—*nulla dies, nulla hora ſine linea*—the ſlow tortoiſe made a long journey by loſing no *time*. He had ſeveral choice ſubjects, for each of which he reſerved a volume by itſelf; and theſe he called works *ſingularis induſtriæ*; ſuch were his *Res Nummaria*, which contained the whole hiſtory of money, and the wealth of different ages and empires; and his *Luſus Urbani*; his Epitome of Baronius, Livy, Tacitus, Cæſar, the two Plinys, and many others; his philological collection of words and ſentences.

PART III.

WHAT authors we ought to read. 1. Every author who is the beſt in his way. 2. Such authors as ſuit beſt with our own genius. 3. The ancient writers are generally to be preferred to modern.

How we ought to read. 1. Not to affect that rambling ſort of reading, which looks at every thing, but ſticks to nothing. 2. To read an author through, from the beginning to the end. 3. Not to read curſorily, but with meditation and ſteadineſs. The reaſons are theſe. 1. Againſt rambling. You muſt ſettle ſomewhere before you can extract. He that is always travelling, will have many landlords, but few friends. Meats do not profit, unleſs they are retained in the ſtomach: the wound will not heal, which is conſtantly interrupted with freſh applications: the plants will not thrive, which are too often tranſplanted. The ſqueamiſh ſtomach is amuſed with variety, and taſtes of many things. Many perſons read, as dogs drink out of the Nile, as they run, and therefore never profit much. Not more than two authors ſhould be ſtudied at the ſame time. And in all authors three things are to be obſerved. 1. The matter or ſubject, with the drift of his argument. 2. The words, ſtyle, and conſtruction of his ſentences. 3. The numbers, and cadence; for not only poets, but orators alſo conſider the harmony of their periods. If the

ſtyle of an author be rough, hobbling, and inharmonious, the reader is diſguſted.

The memory will receive great help from method and imagination. Method is almoſt every thing in memory—*ordo anima memoriæ*. Nothing is ſo irregular in its nature, but that method will reduce it to order, and make it portable—*omnium inſtar mihi ordo*; without it we may as well write on water or ſand. It is not ſo clear what he means by *imagination*; but I ſuppoſe it to be, the frequent thinking of a thing over again in the mind, by which means it will be ſo fixed as never to depart. As the mind was made to contain great things, let it not be overloaded with trifles. Remember *ſin*, to bewail it; *kindneſs*, to return it; *death*, to prepare for it; *mercy*, to hope for it; *wrath*, to fear it; *eternity*, to deſpiſe the world, and all temporal things—ſo to *paſs* through things temporal, as not to loſe the things eternal.

General Rules for a Preacher.

He, of all men, is a ſtudent, who can be nothing without the practice of notifying and collecting: ſo I conſider his caſe by itſelf. Beſides the three claſſes above-mentioned, he ſhould have a book to receive his *ſymbolæ*, under the titles of all the feſtivals and Sundays of the year. Should make himſelf maſter of the Scriptures, the goſpels, leſſons, &c. appointed for each day; and then throw together under each, whatever he meets with conducing to the explanation of them; with all texts and ſubjects proper to be treated of on thoſe days. Of this the author gives examples, and particularly for *aſcenſion day*; producing texts and ſubjects for thirty-four years on that one feſtival. This plan is excellent. Every ſermon ſhould have ſome point of practice to be enforced; it is otherwiſe unprofitable. We love to hear fine expoſitions, and a curious diſplay of learning, &c. ſo we

we come back a little more learned, but not warmed nor excited to piety. Tell me what I am to deſire, and what to avoid; how I may ſtrengthen my weak faith; how repel temptations, and be a match for evil; how I may bear misfortunes without repining myſelf, and proſperity without making others repine—*ſcire diſcimus plerumque, non facere.*

Particular Rules for a Preacher.

I. Fix upon ſome particular point which you would enforce. Aſk yourſelf, what am I going to prove? and how? What head of Chriſtian doctrine do you mean to inculcate, that your audience may more firmly believe it? To this all is to be directed. They that are beſt ſkilled, ſay every good ſermon ſhould be reducible to a ſyllogiſm. For want of this, many fine diſcourſes are good for nothing: they are elegant in language and ſentiment, but produce no effect; they are every thing but what is needful and uſeful: therefore let it be the ſcope of a diſcourſe to promote the ſalvation, and improve the morals of your hearers, not to raiſe their admiration.

II. Let your exordium be ſhort, and relate to the matter that is to come. The head ought not to be half as long as the body. The entrance upon a diſcourſe ſhould be ſuch as to gain the attention of the audience; but he diſguſts them, who keeps them too long in expectation; and when once their attention drops, you will with great difficulty recover it. Therefore let your beginning be ſhort, and to the purpoſe, leſt it be ſaid that you began with fiſh, and ended with fowls. Your concluſion ſhould alſo be ſhort, clear, nervous, and pathetic.

III. Speak ſlow, and never throw your words out too precipitately. It is incredible how this one thing will recommend you. The learned will take you for a perſon of judgment,

judgment, who knows what is proper, and has a command of himſelf; and the unlearned will have time to follow and underſtand you.

IV. Avoid all affectation and ſtiffneſs. Purity of intention, and a deſire for the glory of God, will make your delivery eaſy, humble, and natural. Whatever is unnatural, never pleaſes. Your diction ſhould not be fine and over-wrought, but nearly ſuch as you would uſe in common talk; for this inſinuates readily into the mind. He is the beſt preacher, who forgetting himſelf, ſeems to know nothing but Chriſt crucified. He avoids all vain and curious queſtions, and all novelties, as improper for the pulpit; having nothing in his intentions but the reformation of the people.

V. Suit yourſelf to the audience, the place, and the time. As it is a great fault not to be underſtood at all, it is alſo bad if you are underſtood with difficulty. There are figures of ſpeech which give great help to the underſtanding: ſuch as the proſopopœia, the form of a dialogue, the ſtrong delineation, as if a thing were preſent to the view (hypotypoſis). But above all, there ſhould be a frequent uſe of ſimilitudes; for this is the manner of the Scripture throughout. A ſtrong text often repeated has good effect; as our Saviour, three times in four verſes, uſes that ſtriking expreſſion, the *worm that never dieth*. Him you are to imitate; not only in the *manner*, but in the *duty* of preaching: never omit it; he was always ready for it.

VI. It is of great ſervice to ſtop ſometimes, to recollect yourſelf, and preſerve your preſence of mind. This is particularly neceſſary toward the concluſion, when every nerve muſt be ſtrained to fix what you have explained in the mind of your hearers. Uniſon of tone, or monotony, is ever to be avoided as lifeleſs and unaffecting.

VII. Let human learning be the ſervant, but let divine learning rule. Build nothing but upon the Scriptures: a preacher

preacher ſhould have them nearly by heart; for which purpoſe, he ſhould read at leaſt two chapters every day of his life, and notify therefrom into his claſſes or his *ſymbolæ*. As one egg hath more nouriſhment than a pot full of herbs, one ſentence of the Bible will have more effect than a thouſand from Ariſtotle or Cicero, which are dry and bloodleſs. Many err in this reſpect, who totally, or at leaſt very ſhamefully, neglecting the divine oracles, think they have done finely, when they have painted themſelves with the colourings of Heathen orators, &c.

VIII. Write down your plan, arguments, texts, diſpoſition, &c. in a rough draught firſt; and have all your materials ready before you begin to build. As the work goes on, you may pick and chuſe, leave out or alter, as you ſee beſt. No practice but this can make the compoſition good: *omnis concio bis ſcribenda.*

IX. Above all things divide clearly, and ſort your matter well: the work is more than half finiſhed when this is done: your words and ſentences will come eaſy, and as it were of themſelves. To methodiſe and digeſt well is the point both for the ſpeaker and the hearer—*Qui bene diſtinguit* *, *bene docet*—a ſermon well digeſted may be got by heart over night.

* Three eminent writers, *Fenelon*, *Voltaire*, and Biſhop *Berkeley*, are againſt formally dividing a ſermon: but the reaſons on the other ſide are ſtronger. See *Mauvy* ſur l'eloquence, &c. p. 424. In *Cicero*'s excellent oration *pro lege Manilia*, the *tranſitions* from one head to another are marked and mentioned throughout as diſtinctly and plainly as preachers do in their ſermons—*Quod extremum propoſui—quod reliquum eſt*, &c. It ſeems to be a perfect model of method in compoſition, and ſhould be thoroughly ſtudied as ſuch. *Non mihi tam copia quam* modus *in dicendo quærendus eſt*, ſays the author in his exordium. What would the human figure be, unleſs it were built upon bones and joints, properly connected and covered, ſo that the whole has a regular and elegant appearance? The late learned Dr. *Samuel Johnſon*, in his directions to a clergyman concerning the compoſition of a ſermon, very properly obſerves, that "diviſions not only help the memory of the hearer, but direct the judgment of the writer: they ſupply ſources of invention, and keep every part in its proper place." *Boſwell*'s life of *Johnſon*, Vol. II. p. 324.

X.

X. Never exceed an hour; but rather fall ſhort of it. None can attend more, even though you were to preach roſes and jewels; nor can the memory carry off more. When the attention is exhauſted, you ſpeak without effect: the full ſtomach loaths the honey and the honeycomb: that which is moderate and well diſpoſed, will be the ſweeteſt—*in fine ne corrumpas.*

XI. Teach nothing to others, of which you are not perſuaded yourſelf—*ſi vis me flere*, &c. Nothing will reach the heart, but that which comes from the heart. How great is the difference between him who collects and repeats, and him who ſpeaks affectionately of that truth which he knows and feels! To gather ſcraps from homilies and ſermons, and then conſarcinate, is poor work: but if nothing better can be done, make it your own, by thinking well on what you have collected from others.

XII. Reprove vices ſharply, but not perſons. Great men, and perſons in authority, ſhould not be named, or even pointed at; which exaſperates without amending: private admonition ſhould rather be uſed. Never ſpare the vices which are moſt in faſhion; but even here all bitterneſs is to be avoided—according to that admonition of St. Paul, *reprove, rebuke, exhort, with all* long-ſuffering *and doctrine.* 2 Tim. iv. 2. Let your pity prevail againſt your indignation—remember Chriſt weeping over the guilty Jeruſalem; and never forget, that ſins, not ſinners, are to be laſhed.

XIII. Deteſt all pride, firſt in yourſelf, and then in others. Let your ſpeech, and even your countenance, breathe humility, and lowlineſs of heart. The pompous orator is a mimic, or a tragedian; more fit for the ſtage than the pulpit; and his only object is to gain applauſe. The preacher who is truly humble, deſpiſes no man, nor doth he hurt any one by private reflections. He will not only bear reproof, but court it: he will get ſome faithful friends to tell him his faults. Chryſoſtom ſuffered himſelf to be admoniſhed

moniſhed and corrected by an old woman. He that is to know himſelf, muſt have faithful friends, or bitter enemies; and the divine Spirit only can enable him to make a proper uſe of them.

XIV. Imitate nobody in preaching. It is uſeful to hear good preachers, but to imitate their manner is not ſo. Every man is moſt powerful in his own natural character. In other ſciences imitation is good: here it is bad. Every man ſhould conſult his own genius, and cultivate it to the beſt of his ability. When a man is out of himſelf, then he is affected; and affectation ſpoils every thing.

XV. Do what you ſay. Without this nobody believes you. Be the ſame out of the pulpit as in it: otherwiſe it will be caſt in your teeth, "he ſays and *does not*." Be ye then doers of the word, and not preachers of it only. The Goſpel is never ſo effectually recommended, as when we ſee it realized in the life and manners of the preacher.

Concluſion.

THE improvement of our time is the firſt conſideration in human life; for on time depends eternity. Nothing but time can make a ſcholar or a divine; and he that makes the moſt of it, by ſome ſuch method as is here recommended, is the wiſeſt man. Many never diſcover its value till they have loſt it, and would give the whole world, if they had it, to recover it again. The only laudable avarice is that of our time; of which there have been many great examples. Cato Uticenſis made it his practice to carry a book with him into the ſenate-houſe, that inſtead of hearing idle talk, he might read till buſineſs began. Plato had Sophron, the poet of Syracuſe, laid at his pillow when he was dying.

Abbas

Abbas Dorotheus had a book open while he was eating, and by his bed ſide againſt he waked. Bernard ſaid, "let us talk this hour out; on this hour eternity may depend." Beware of thieves, but eſpecially of thoſe who rob you of your time, for which they can never make you any amends. Read, note, be vigilant, be active, ſtock your memory; let no hour or minute be without its uſe. *Magna vitæ pars elabitur* malè *agentibus, maxima* nihil *agentibus, tota* aliud *agentibus*, i. e. in doing what is nothing to the purpoſe: Teach us, good Lord, ſo to value our time, and *number our days*, as to *apply our hearts unto wiſdom.*

BISHOP

BISHOP ANDREWS.

A SHORT ACCOUNT OF HIM,

WITH THE USE MADE OF HIS CHARACTER, BY BISHOP HORNE.

THE attention of Dr. Horne to the writings of this eminent prelate commenced in the early part of his life, and increaſed with his years; till he publiſhed Biſhop *Andrews*'s Devotions, nearly after the pattern of Dean *Stanhope*'s edition.

Biſhop Andrews was, without exception, the firſt preacher of his time; and his diſcourſes and lectures, though ſomewhat obſolete, from their antiquity, in ſtyle and manner, are yet ſo excellent for the truth, learning, eloquence, and piety, found in them, that when we have laid down rules for a preacher, no character can be produced, in which they were better exemplified.

His funeral ſermon was preached by Biſhop Buckridge. It is there ſaid, that they who ſpake truth of him could not but ſpeak well of him; and if they ſpake falſely of him, his life and manners did confute them. As ſoon as he was put to ſchool, he counted all the time loſt that was not ſpent in his ſtudies. He ſat late, and aroſe at four in the morning: not like moderns at ſeven or eight, with their heads and ſtomachs aching—*qui mundum hesternum edormiunt crapulam.* He loved not the things of this world, though he had them as a ſteward. He ſent alms under other mens' names;

names: he ſtayed not till the poor ſought him, but he firſt ſought them.

In moſt of his ſermons he was ſo careful and exact, that there were few of them which were not thrice between the hammer and the anvil, before they were preached. He ever miſliked often and looſe preaching, without proper ſtudy of antiquity; and uſed to ſay, that if he preached twice on a Sunday, he prated once. He thought the word of God was never well enough handled, and the work of God never well enough done, till it received his utmoſt care and circumſpection. When he could not preach, he went but little to court: that only is a prieſt's buſineſs there. After he had an epiſcopal houſe, with a chapel, he kept monthly communions inviolably, though he received at court the ſame month. It was his cuſtom to offer twice at the altar; and he gave his ſervants money that it might not be a burthen to them.

He privately complained much of three ſins: uſury, from which he withdrew many: ſimony, and ſacrilege; wherein the reformed were ſuffering correction and chaſtiſement from God: and he wiſhed ſome perſon would collect an account of the families ſo raiſed and ruined *.

His life was in a great meaſure a life of prayer; and his book of private devotions, compoſed in Greek and Latin, for his own daily uſe, was, towards the concluſion of his life, ſcarcely ever out of his hands. In the time of his fever and laſt ſickneſs, beſides the prayers which were often read to him, in which he repeated the Confeſſion and other parts with an audible voice ſo long as his ſtrength ſerved;

* This was afterwards done (perhaps in conſequence of what Biſhop *Andrews* had ſaid) by Sir *Henry Spelman*, who has written largely upon the ſubject in ſeveral of his works, and has been much attended to. There is a Treatiſe, the publication of which was omitted when his Poſthumous Works were collected, under the title of the *Hiſtory and Fate of Sacrilege*; in which there is a curious chapter on the Great Sacrilege of Henry VIII. with the conſequences to the king, and his agents, and the lords that voted in his parliaments, and to the whole kingdom, particularly to the poor. Some juſt Remarks are added on the contrary ſpirit in Queen *Elizabeth*.

he

he did, as was well obſerved by certain tokens in him, continually pray to himſelf, though he ſeemed otherwiſe to reſt or ſlumber; and when he could pray no longer with his voice, by lifting up his eyes and hands he prayed ſtill; and when they failed, he ſtill prayed with his heart, till it pleaſed God to take his bleſſed ſoul to himſelf.

The Puritans of his time called his doctrine atheiſtical, irrational, and worſe than that of Arminius. He had foretold the deſtruction of the church of England by their means, in a ſermon before the clergy in the year 1593; where, after an account of them and their preachings, he ſays—*Niſi doctrinæ voci attendatis, idque maturè,* BREVI *nulla futura eſt omnino, cui (ſi maximè velitis), poſſitis attendere*—but that a Babel ſhould be erected inſtead of Sion *.

In the preface to an edition of his Lectures, it is well obſerved of the eloquence of the pulpit, that the abuſe of it is worſe than that of the ſtage. For as *faith cometh by hearing*, ſo doth infidelity; and that by hearing the word of God; by hearing it perverted; not rightly opened, nor well applied. So Mr. *Herbert* ſays, ſermons are no indifferent things; people are either the better or the worſe for them. When any diſturbance or ſedition was meditated by the ſaints, tickets were diſpatched to the parſons, to preach and

* From a paſſage in the folio of his Engliſh Diſcourſes, he appears alſo to have foreſeen and predicted, that the government of this country would at length be ſwallowed up by the prevailing power of the third eſtate; which actually came to paſs about forty years after. In a Diſcourſe on Judges xvii. 6. "There was then no king in Iſrael, but every man did that which "was right in his own eyes," in pleading for the neceſſity of preſerving the power of the crown inviolate over the three eſtates, in the year 1606, he has the following remarkable words:—"Of thoſe three eſtates, that which ſwayeth moſt, doth in a manner overtop the reſt, and like a foregrown member depriveth the other of their proportion of growth. The world hath ſeen it in *two* already (the *Spiritual Lords*, and the *Barons*) and *ſhall daily more and more ſee it in the third.* Requiſite, therefore, there be *one over all*, that is *none of all*, but a *common Father* to all, that may poiſe and keep them all *in æquilibrio*, that ſo all the eſtates may be evenly balanced." See p. 122 of the Appendix.

pray up the thing deſigned. King James the 1ſt, for twelve entire years together, during his reſiderce in Scotland (his reign we can hardly call it) prayed to God upon his knees before every ſermon he was to hear, that he might hear nothing from the preacher that might afterwards grieve him. But after his coming into England, he ſaid his caſe was ſo much altered, that it was his prayer to edify by what he heard. In his Βασιλ. δωρον, Lib. II. p. 41 ,42. he gives to his ſon Charles this character of the Puritans:—"take heed of ſuch Puritans, very peſts in the church and in the commonwealth; whom no deſerts can oblige, nor oaths or promiſes bind; breathing nothing but ſedition and calumnies, aſpiring without meaſure, railing without reaſon, and making their own imagination the ſquare of their conſcience.

A NOTE BY THE EDITOR.

Biſhop Horne, in the early part of his life, found himſelf ſo much informed by ſtudying all the works of Biſhop Andrews, and ſo animated by his example, that he became ſtrongly poſſeſſed with the deſire of making himſelf uſeful as a preacher in the church of England, after the pattern of this learned prelate. To his notes on the life of Biſhop Andrews, he added a prayer to God for grace and help to enable him to ſow the ſincere word of life in the hearts of men; and that the remembrance of this holy Biſhop might ſtir him up ever more and more to follow his example, in labour, in diligence, in devotion and charity; that ſo he might be found worthy at laſt to *ſit at his feet* in a better world. His petition was fulfilled in every reſpect, ſo far as our obſervation reaches: but whether he will ſit at the feet of Biſhop Andrews, or whether Biſhop Andrews will ſit at his feet, none but the great Judge of both can determine, who will reward them according to their works.

Biſhop Andrews is reported to have been well learned in fifteen languages, ancient and modern; and to have been the

the greateſt civilian, as well as the beſt preacher, of his time; and they who beſt knew how to praiſe him, ſaid, his character never was exceeded in any of the three capacities in which he excelled; that is, as *Doctor* Andrews in the ſchools, *Biſhop* Andrews in the pulpit, and *Saint* Andrews in the cloſet.

He has three ſermons upon the Paſſion of Chriſt; one of which, on Lam. i. 12. is juſtly reputed the higheſt wrought diſcourſe extant on that great ſubject; and Biſhop Horne took a delight in preaching it in modern language.

ELENCHUS MATERIÆ THEOLOGICÆ;

A

SHORT INDEX TO THE MATTER OF DIVINITY.

DIVINITY makes known to us the *kingdom of God.*

1. His *celeſtial* or inviſible kingdom, over angels and ſpirits.

2. His *eccleſiaſtical*, over the church upon earth, which is the body of Chriſt in its militant ſtate.

3. His *political* kingdom, over the governments of the world, as King of kings and Lord of lords.

4. His *ſpiritual* kingdom, of grace in the hearts of men, to direct and aſſiſt them in the conflict between the fleſh and the ſpirit: in which view, every individual man is a ſtate by himſelf, a church in a ſingle perſon.

All theſe ſeveral polities ſhould bear the image as nearly as may be of the *celeſtial* government, in which *order* and *concord* are conſummate and without interruption.

It makes known to us alſo the KINGDOM of SATAN, in oppoſition to that of the Bleſſed Trinity. Its characters are theſe following:

1. As God is the fountain of good, this is the fountain of evil.

2. God creates in goodneſs: Satan deſtroys in malice.

3. The angels of God miniſter to the ſalvation of believers; the evil angels tempt them to ſin.

4. The Son of God redeems from death: Satan draws men back to perdition.

5. Chriſt is the head of his body the church: Satan is the head of the whole body of *Antichriſt*, and worketh in all the children of diſobedience.

6. The divine Spirit purifies the heart by faith; Satan pollutes it by infidelity.

7. The

7. The Son, being the wiſdom of God, wins us thereby to ſalvation: Satan works by fraud and cunning for our ſeduction.

8. The good Spirit edifies; the evil ſpirit ſubverts.

9. The one unites; the other ſeparates.

The duties of the Chriſtian life are all comprized under the three Graces of

FAITH, HOPE, and CHARITY.

FAITH opens the door of heaven, and is our evidence of things not ſeen—yet is capable of *full aſſurance*. It lies between knowledge and opinion. Actual knowledge of the things of God, is reſerved for another life: opinion is a ſtate of ignorance, ſuch as the Heathens were under; and ſuch as they are now in, who put themſelves into the ſtate of Heathens. Faith is ſpiritual; and as ſuch contrary to that fleſhly or worldly wiſdom, which is according to the luſts of man. The Jews are at preſent incapable of it, from that hardneſs of heart into which they are fallen, in conſequence of having ſought righteouſneſs from the works of the ceremonial law.

"Faith worketh in us,"

1. Righteouſneſs, which is the fruit of faith, and can ariſe from no other principle.

2. Peace of conſcience, through a ſenſe of the forgiveneſs of ſin.

3. Certainty in reſpect to the Scriptures.

4. Ready and pure obedience to the will of God.

5. The true fear of God, though we ſee him not.

6. It produces contempt of this world, being the victory that overcometh the world.

7. It therefore gives conſtancy under all trials: it endures as ſeeing him that is inviſible.

8. Moderation in proſperity.

9. Diſtruſt of our own powers.

10. Full confidence in the divine mercy.

"Faith is nouriſhed and increaſed,"

1. By frequent prayer.

2. By frequent thankſgiving.

3. By the Holy Euchariſt.
4. By that mortification which keeps us ſeparate from the world.
5. By the reading of the Scriptures.
6. By daily meditation on heavenly things.
7. By acts of love and charity.

" Lord increaſe our faith!"

HOPE is that part of a living faith, by which we expect things to come, according to the promiſes of God. It lies between the two extremes of preſumption and deſpair. It is a reaſonable virtue, not an enthuſiaſtic or groundleſs perſuaſion of the mind, like preſumption and deſpair. It has the ſame effect in the Chriſtian as in the huſbandman, who ploweth and ſoweth in expectation of the harveſt; and ſpares neither labour nor expence. So the Chriſtian is never weary of well doing; knowing that we ſhall reap if we faint not. It bears ſufferings with chearfulneſs, as knowing that all the ſufferings of this preſent time, are not worthy to be compared with the glory that ſhall be revealed in us. It is the ſtaff of life, to ſupport the ſteps of thoſe who would otherwiſe faint in their journey through this wilderneſs: it preſents daily to the mind the promiſes and bleſſings of Canaan.

CHARITY, is the love of God for himſelf, and the love of man for the love of God; which is beſt ſhewn by helping him forward in the way of his ſalvation. No man loves God who does not love his neighbour; nor can any love his neighbour truly who does not firſt love God. Charity gives perfection to the will, as faith does to the underſtanding. Faith begets charity, and charity increaſes faith; which without charity will go out, as a lamp that has no oil. By ſin faith is darkened, and by degrees totally extinguiſhed. Faith increaſed renders charity vigorous: faith is the root; the works of charity are the branches bearing fruit; and the branches can bear no fruit, but ſo far only as the root ſupplies them with ſap. Without this, they dry up and are withered.

Without theſe, man is all ſin, or has nothing toward ſalvation.

DIRECTIONS

DIRECTIONS

FOR

EXTRACTING AND APPLYING PROFITABLY THE MATTER OF A TEXT;

WITH AN EXAMPLE.

THE Scripture itſelf teaches how this is to be done:

Rom. xv. 4. "Whatſoever things were written afore-"time were written for our learning, that we through "patience and comfort of the Scriptures might have hope."

1 Cor. x. 11. "Theſe things happened unto them for "enſamples, and they are written for our admonition."

2 Tim. iii. 16. "All Scripture is given by inſpiration of "God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for inſtruction in righteouſneſs:

"That the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly "furniſhed unto all good works."

Hence we learn for what purpoſes the Scriptures are intended; and conſequently, that they are to be uſed for "doctrine," or teaching; for "reproof;" for "correction;" for "inſtruction in righteouſneſs;" for "comfort," and "admonition."

I. Προς διδασκαλιαν, for DOCTRINE. The words teach, that we ſhould always be ready to publiſh the truth of the Goſpel. 2. Even though we ſhould loſe all by ſo doing. 3. Chriſt and his truth are above all that is in the world, even life itſelf. 4. That there is eternal puniſhment for thoſe who are tempted to deny him. 5. That we need not

fear, becauſe God always hath us under his care, ſo that none can hurt us till he permits. 6. This we may be ſure of, becauſe even the leaſt things, the ſmalleſt of creatures, ſeemingly inſignificant, have his regard; much more we.

II. Προς ελενχον, for REPROOF; i. e. *confutation* or *conviction*. 1. Of thoſe who think it ſufficient to believe with the heart, but palliate and diſſemble with men, as times and intereſts ſerve—as in perſecution—"with the mouth "confeſſion is made unto ſalvation." 2. For the confutation of Epicureans, who remove God from the government of the world. 3. Of Stoics, who govern the world by fate. 4. Againſt thoſe who believe chance and fortune. 5. Thoſe who hold only a general providence, not deſcending to minute particulars. 6. Thoſe who truſt more to worldly helps, than to the power of God, which made and preſerves even the hairs of our heads. 7. Thoſe who cruelly or inconſiderately deſtroy thoſe creatures, which it is the care of God to preſerve.

III. Προς παιδειαν—*ad vitæ morumque inſtitutionem.*—1. To have the true fear of God before our eyes: to meditate conſtantly on the torments prepared for thoſe who deny Chriſt; that we may amend our ſinful lives. 2. That we may learn to deſpiſe worldly greatneſs, leſt we loſe our ſouls for the preſervation of it—therefore to leave all for him and his glorious kingdom. 3. To think of the preſence of God ready at hand to help—to implore his aſſiſtance, and be firmly perſuaded our actions are governed and guided by him—that there is no danger from which he cannot ſecure or deliver us.

IV. Προς επανορθωσιν, CORRECTION. 1. Of the negligence of thoſe who ſeek not by earneſt prayer for that pure love of God which will enable them to part with life itſelf; and for that better ſort of fear which is proper to children toward their parent—this to be done more eſpecially in times of danger—that they may endure unto the end and be ſaved.

2. Of

2. Of the blindneſs of ſuch as do not ſee the care of God's providence in the government of the world. 3. Of the ingratitude of thoſe who do not conſtantly acknowledge it with thankfulneſs. 4. Of thoſe who abuſe any of the creatures of God. Thus we are corrected in our miſtakes, and ſpurred on to attention and diligence.

V. Προς Παρακλησιν—for COMFORT. Is it not a great conſolation under trials and afflictions, that God is not unmindful of us; that we and all our concerns are in the hands of him, who careth for us; and ſo careth, that not an hair falls to the ground without him?

Let it be obſerved that all things in the Scriptures are to be brought home to the preſent ſtate of the church, kingdom, town, pariſh, univerſity, college, family, and to the heart of each individual. The Scripture has ſomething for every perſon, condition, ſituation, that ever was or ever ſhall be.

Thoſe of parts and capacity, who deſire to learn, find doctrines of heavenly philoſophy—thoſe who have erred in faith or practice, find ſharp reproof—the ſimple and the humble, who aſpire to no great heights, but are ſollicitous to live righteouſly, find inſtruction, παιδειαν—thoſe who know the truth but are dull and heavy, find exhortations and reproofs—thoſe who are in ſorrow and affliction, find conſolation—hiſtories of that which is paſt ſhew what is to be expected, and ſo ſerve προς νουθεσιαν, for warning and admonition of dangers and deliverances. See 1 Cor. x. 11.

Doctrine promotes knowledge; *reproof* reclaims the wanderer, *inſtruction* ſets forward in the path of life; *correction* calls ſinners to repentance; *conſolation* raiſes the weak and afflicted to hope and gladneſs. Here is every thing that can be wanted to make the man of God perfect, thoroughly furniſhed unto every good work.

Lord teach our ignorance, reprove our errors, inſtruct us unto righteouſneſs, quicken our ſloth, comfort our ſorrows—thou art good and gracious; O teach us thy ſtatutes.

ENTHU-

ENTHUSIASM.

1. *What it is.*

ENTHUSIASM is the vice of a mind falſely ſuppoſing itſelf under the immediate inſpiration of God. It is above the uſe of ordinances; and has a near alliance with Schiſm, in which it commonly ends. It is the peculiar engine of the devil, by which he does moſt harm. His kingdom is beſt advanced, when he can paſs his deluſions for the dictates of the Holy Ghoſt. He has many ways of tempting men to ſin; but if any pleaſes him moſt, it is when he is taken for the ſpirit of God; as of old in the Heathen oracles.

2. *The uſual Cauſes of it.*

Enthuſiaſm is bred in theſe days from ignorance of the Scripture, and of Chriſtian antiquity. The regular way to true piety is by knowledge, by the *purifying of the heart by faith* (Acts xv. 9.) and hearing the word of truth rightly divided. There is no real enthuſiaſm till we are taken off from the word, and have aſſumed ſome other principle of knowledge. Labour therefore in that, and never attempt to ſet up without it. They who know not the marks of the true ſpirit, and would yet be doing great things in an extraordinary character, are in danger from the evil ſpirit; who takes advantage of that zeal which is without knowledge, and turns it to his own purpoſes. Not underſtanding rightly the means of grace, or thinking them below their attention, they claim the grace of God without the

means; which being contrary to his will, who has appointed both an inward and an outward religion, accommodated to the ſoul and body of man, it is not ſtrange if they get ſomething elſe inſtead of it. Negligence in ſome of the clergy of the church, and the want of diſcipline, gives offence to thoſe who are too ready to ſeek it: in which caſe they run after ſome better way, and are eaſily made a prey of.

The Marks of Enthuſiaſm.

It affects great and extraordinary fervours of devotion, above the meaſure of other men; and diſcourages the piety of ſober Chriſtians, as formal and lifeleſs. The proof of its pretenſions being not in its fruits, but in its feelings, which are evidence only to the perſon himſelf; it refuſes to be brought to a trial, and ſo is above conviction. Thus did the *Montaniſts*, when the Catholic biſhops would have exorciſed *Maximilla*. *G. Keith* accepted the repeated challenges of the Quakers, and would have met them at Turner's-hall; but they ſhuffled and refuſed to come *. They are not obliged to anſwer any thing; having an inward teſtimony that they are right, and all others wrong; and to queſtion this, is to *quench the ſpirit*, and deſpiſe propheſyings: ſo it is impoſſible they ſhould be reclaimed.

Enthuſiaſm rarely fails to betray great contempt of the prieſthood, hierarchy, government, diſcipline, and ſucceſſion of the church; and depreciates the church itſelf, as if nothing were meant by it but a building with ſtone-walls. It deſpiſes the neceſſary labour of ſtudy. Forty years were requiſite to form an *Andrews*; but an ordinary perſon, if a gifted enthuſiaſt, ſhall be far beyond him in a few days. Hence ſchools and univerſities may be laid aſide. The enthuſiaſt has charity for every thing but the church; becauſe the church only has the form of ſound doctrine, with the hiſtory of truth and error from the beginning; and ſo can bring to nothing their boaſted ſanctity and pretended reve-

* See Leſlie's Works, Vol. II. 253.

lations:

lations: therefore they cannot ſpeak of the church with patience, nor bear with a churchman.

The affectation of ſuperior auſterity, is a grand deluſion, by which deceivers impoſe upon the ſimple. The Montaniſts, in the firſt centuries, deſpiſed the Catholics as a carnal people, becauſe they themſelves oſtentatiouſly practiſed greater mortification and ſeverity. As to convulſions, roarings, ravings, and falling ſenſeleſs on the ground, &c. theſe ever were the marks of a dæmoniac, not of the ſpirit of Chriſt, which is firſt pure, then peaceable. Montanus therefore was reckoned poſſeſſed; and the Quakers in this country had all the ſigns of it, as Mr. Leſlie has fully ſhewn in his writings againſt them, wherein a ſtrange myſtery of iniquity is detected. Few people know at this day what the Quakers were at their firſt ſetting out.

The Character of Enthuſiaſm.

ENTHUSIASM has no principle but imagination; to which it has committed itſelf: and when there is no rule but fancy and impulſe, every thing a man does is right, and he can think himſelf in the exaltation of charity, when he is in the gall of bitterneſs. He riſes to a ſphere above others, from whence he looks down upon them with diſdain, which he calls piety. From a looſe, idle, and diſorderly life (for ſo it hath often happened) he is converted without repentance, and commences teacher without knowledge. He finds latitudinarianiſm very convenient, and can take the colour of every company he is in. He thinks well of every thing but a churchman; yet he can keep himſelf within the church, while he makes his court to her enemies. He boaſts that he has conquered the fear of man, when he is paſt ſhame or feeling.

A certain perſon, who after a profligate life, took to the reading of Mr. *Law*, without preparatory knowledge, fell into a ſtate of great mortification; preferred faſting to the ſacrament, and told his friends he received more benefit by it. He ſoon began to talk freely of the other ſacrament; decried

decried infant baptiſm, and all water baptiſm *: and the church having ſet apart Wedneſdays and Fridays, as days of mortification, he fixed on Monday as his faſting day. He waited for new revelations to his mind, while he neglected that already given, which is ſufficient for every purpoſe. He ſpake ſlightly of an acquaintance, as having once been in a fair way to be a Chriſtian. The fact was this: that acquaintance had been inſtructed from his childhood in the Holy Scripture, which enabled him to ſee through the deception, and avoid it.

The Evils of Enthuſiaſm.

ENTHUSIASM has been the root of the greateſt evils that have befallen the Chriſtian church. From this aroſe the Popiſh legends of their ſaints, which have been uſed as inſtruments, in the hands of evil-minded perſons, to induce them to reject the belief of the real miracles of Chriſt and his Apoſtles: and from hence our ſeveral ſorts of Diſſenters took their riſe; till they were once ſettled and eſtabliſhed, and then dropt it by degrees, becauſe it would unſettle themſelves. It is a perfect oppoſition to all rule or government; and there can be no order kept where it is admitted †.

Among

* In a hiſtory of the church, during the three firſt centuries, by *Mr. Milner*, the following obſervation occurs on the ſacrament of baptiſm:—"In Cyprian's time, to call baptiſm itſelf the new-birth was not very dangerous. In our age it is poiſon itſelf; for it has long been the faſhion to ſuppoſe all baptized perſons regenerate of courſe." P. 358. It does not appear how baptiſm and the new-birth can be ſeparate things, when the expreſs words of our bleſſed Saviour—BORN of WATER—have joined them together: neither do we know who has been *poiſoned* by any eſtabliſhed falſe doctrine concerning baptiſm; when the church teaches us to pray for *ſpiritual regeneration*, and *heavenly virtues*, and that every baptized Chriſtian may *lead the reſt of his life according to that beginning*. If the Goſpel does not promiſe the *new-birth* to *water-baptiſm*, where and when doth it teach us to expect it *without baptiſm?*

† Preface to the *Snake in the Graſs*, p. 12.

"Extraordinary inſpirations are not to be credited, unleſs vouched by miracles, which God always ſent to atteſt an extraordinary commiſſion. And

if

lations: therefore they cannot ſpeak of the church with patience, nor bear with a churchman.

The affectation of ſuperior auſterity, is a grand deluſion, by which deceivers impoſe upon the ſimple. The Montaniſts, in the firſt centuries, deſpiſed the Catholics as a carnal people, becauſe they themſelves oſtentatiouſly practiſed greater mortification and ſeverity. As to convulſions, roarings, ravings, and falling ſenſeleſs on the ground, &c. theſe ever were the marks of a dæmoniac, not of the ſpirit of Chriſt, which is firſt pure, then peaceable. Montanus therefore was reckoned poſſeſſed; and the Quakers in this country had all the ſigns of it, as Mr. Leſlie has fully ſhewn in his writings againſt them, wherein a ſtrange myſtery of iniquity is detected. Few people know at this day what the Quakers were at their firſt ſetting out.

The Character of Enthuſiaſm.

ENTHUSIASM has no principle but imagination; to which it has committed itſelf: and when there is no rule but fancy and impulſe, every thing a man does is right, and he can think himſelf in the exaltation of charity, when he is in the gall of bitterneſs. He riſes to a ſphere above others, from whence he looks down upon them with diſdain, which he calls piety. From a looſe, idle, and diſorderly life (for ſo it hath often happened) he is converted without repentance, and commences teacher without knowledge. He finds latitudinarianiſm very convenient, and can take the colour of every company he is in. He thinks well of every thing but a churchman; yet he can keep himſelf within the church, while he makes his court to her enemies. He boaſts that he has conquered the fear of man, when he is paſt ſhame or feeling.

A certain perſon, who after a profligate life, took to the reading of Mr. *Law*, without preparatory knowledge, fell into a ſtate of great mortification; preferred faſting to the ſacrament, and told his friends he received more benefit by it. He ſoon began to talk freely of the other ſacrament; decried

decried infant baptiſm, and all water baptiſm *: and the church having ſet apart Wedneſdays and Fridays, as days of mortification, he fixed on Monday as his faſting day. He waited for new revelations to his mind, while he neglected that already given, which is ſufficient for every purpoſe. He ſpake ſlightly of an acquaintance, as having once been in a fair way to be a Chriſtian. The fact was this: that acquaintance had been inſtructed from his childhood in the Holy Scripture, which enabled him to ſee through the deception, and avoid it.

The Evils of Enthuſiaſm.

ENTHUSIASM has been the root of the greateſt evils that have befallen the Chriſtian church. From this aroſe the Popiſh legends of their ſaints, which have been uſed as inſtruments, in the hands of evil-minded perſons, to induce them to reject the belief of the real miracles of Chriſt and his Apoſtles: and from hence our ſeveral ſorts of Diſſenters took their riſe; till they were once ſettled and eſtabliſhed, and then dropt it by degrees, becauſe it would unſettle themſelves. It is a perfect oppoſition to all rule or government; and there can be no order kept where it is admitted †.

Among

* In a hiſtory of the church, during the three firſt centuries, by Mr. *Milner*, the following obſervation occurs on the ſacrament of baptiſm:—"In Cyprian's time, to call baptiſm itſelf the new-birth was not very dangerous. In our age it is poiſon itſelf; for it has long been the faſhion to ſuppoſe all baptized perſons regenerate of courſe." P. 358. It does not appear how baptiſm and the new-birth can be ſeparate things, when the expreſs words of our bleſſed Saviour—BORN of WATER—have joined them together: neither do we know who has been *poiſoned* by any eſtabliſhed falſe doctrine concerning baptiſm; when the church teaches us to pray for *ſpiritual regeneration*, and *heavenly virtues*, and that every baptized Chriſtian may *lead the reſt of his life according to that beginning*. If the Goſpel does not promiſe the *new-birth* to *water-baptiſm*, where and when doth it teach us to expect it *without baptiſm?*

† Preface to the *Snake in the Graſs*, p. 12.

"Extraordinary inſpirations are not to be credited, unleſs vouched by miracles, which God always ſent to atteſt an extraordinary commiſſion. And

if

Among the other evils of Enthuſiaſm, it is not the leaſt, that a diſgrace is thereby brought on all appearances of godly zeal, and Chriſtian piety. An evil word goes out againſt a good man, and the effect of his labours is leſſened, if not entirely defeated. The beſt gold may be brought under ſuſpicion, if malice takes advantage of the counterfeits that are abroad, with deſign to poiſon the ignorant, who know not how to diſtinguiſh. Thus ſaid the Jews of our bleſſed Saviour, "he hath a devil, and is mad, why hear "ye him?" At the time of Chriſt's miniſtry, many were poſſeſſed by devils; and the fact being true in general, would be credited of any particular: but the ſcandal was raiſed by perſons who had neither godlineſs nor honeſty. And if he who ſpake as never man ſpake, and confirmed his word with miracles and ſigns, could not eſcape the fouleſt cenſure, the beſt man upon earth, be his caution and prudence what it will, can hardly preſerve an uninjured reputation: they that ſcrupled not to call the Maſter of the houſe Beelzebub, will never ſpare thoſe of his houſehold. The character of a ſober Chriſtian will always be in danger from two ſorts of people, the lukewarm, and the fanatic; from thoſe who have too much religion, and thoſe who have too

if they are pretended to come from him, and do not, we are ſure they muſt come from the devil.

"Enthuſiaſts have no principles: they have no rule but their own fancy, which is ſtrongeſt in madmen: and this they miſtake for inſpiration, and then their madneſs is at the height. It is as inconſtant as the wind; for they can promiſe themſelves nothing for an hour together.

"Enthuſiaſm is an art, by which we impoſe upon ourſelves as well as upon others. They ſay a man may tell a lye, till he comes to believe it himſelf: and a ſtrong enthuſiaſtic habit may fix a man's thoughts upon a beloved object, till it dazzles his underſtanding, and glares ſo in his ſight, that the worſt abſurdities will go down, and the higheſt blaſphemy obtain the character of piety and devotion. It is a fatal miſtake of the ſoul, and generally irrecoverable, when it falls in love with its own diſeaſe. In a calenture, the unhappy patient miſtakes an unfathomable ocean for a pleaſant field, as the enthuſiaſt miſtakes preſumption and blaſphemy for holy contemplation and humility; which, in effect, is miſtaking hell itſelf for heaven."—[From Biſhop *Horne*'s Remarks on the latter Writings of Mr. *Law*.]

little,

little. With the former ſort his piety will be lifeleſs and formal; and the latter will brand him for an enthuſiaſt. Thus it was, and thus it ever will be: true piety, like all other virtue, is in the middle, between two extremes.

The Prevention and Cure.

THE cauſes of Enthuſiaſm being known, its cure muſt be oppoſite to its cauſes, on the principle of what the phyſicians call *medicina contraria*. If Enthuſiaſm ariſes from ignorance of the Scripture, and the doctrine and diſcipline of the primitive church, let the Scripture be ſtudied, and the religion of the firſt Chriſtians enquired into. One way to be ſecured againſt any root of evil, is to ſee and conſider the fruits of it; and the fruits of Enthuſiaſm, with all its extravagances, were never more conſpicuous than in our Engliſh Quakers; whoſe errors are completely laid open in Mr. *Leſlie's Snake in the Graſs*; a piece too curious and uſeful to be neglected: and there is a preface to it, (already quoted) deſcribing the enthuſiaſm of *Antonia Bourignon*: ſhewing, from her example, the marks by which Enthuſiaſm may be known, and detecting it under all its diſguiſes. To that preface the reader is referred for any thing that may be wanting in theſe ſhort obſervations.

N. B. The above diſcourſe, though excellent for its method and matter, is written with ſuch abbreviations and references in the author's manuſcript, that the Editor has been obliged ſometimes to interpret, and ſometimes to fill it up to the beſt of his judgment.

SCHISM.

TEXTS OF SCRIPTURE RELATING TO IT.

IT tends to ſubvert the kingdom of Chriſt. Matth. xii. 25. "Every kingdom divided againſt itſelf is brought to de-"ſolation; and every city or houſe divided againſt itſelf "ſhall not ſtand." It is a work of the fleſh. 1 Cor. iii. 3. "Ye are yet carnal; for whereas there is among you en-"vying, and ſtrife, and diviſions, διχοστασιαι, are ye not "carnal, and walk as men?" Gal. v. 19, 20. "The "works of the fleſh are manifeſt, which are theſe, hatred, "variance, emulations, wrath, ſtrife, ſeditions, hereſies." 2 Tim. iv. 3. "The time will come when they will not "endure ſound doctrine, but after their own LUSTS they "ſhall heap to themſelves teachers, having itching ears. "And they ſhall turn away their ears from the truth, and "ſhall be turned unto fables. But WATCH thou in all "things, &c." 2 Pet. ii. 10. "The Lord reſerves the "unjuſt unto the day of judgment to be puniſhed; but "chiefly them that walk after the *fleſh*, in the luſt of un-"cleanneſs, and *deſpiſe government:* preſumptuous are they, "ſelf-willed; they are not afraid to ſpeak evil of digni-"ties." Jude 8. "Theſe filthy dreamers defile the fleſh, "deſpiſe dominion, and ſpeak evil of dignities." 11. "Woe unto them, for they have gone in the way of Cain." 18. "They [the Apoſtles] told you there ſhould be mockers "in the laſt time, who ſhould walk after their own un-"godly luſts. Theſe be they who *ſeparate themſelves*, ſen-"ſual,

" ſual, having not the ſpirit." Jam. iii. 13. " Who is a " wiſe man, and endued with knowledge among you? Let " him ſhew out of a good converſation his works with " meekneſs of wiſdom. But if ye have bitter envyings " and ſtrife in your hearts, glory not, and lie not againſt " the truth. This wiſdom deſcendeth not from above, but " is earthly, ſenſual, deviliſh. For where envying and " ſtrife is, there is confuſion, and every evil work. But " the wiſdom that is from above, is firſt pure, then peace- " able, gentle, and eaſy to be intreated, full of mercy and " good fruits, without *partiality*, and without *hypocriſy*. " And the fruit of righteouſneſs is ſown in peace of them " that make peace. From whence come wars and fightings " (or brawlings) amongſt you? come they not hence, even " of your luſts which war in your members?"

Schiſm excludes from the kingdom of heaven. Gal. v. 20, 21. " They that do ſuch things, ſhall not inherit the " kingdom of heaven." It is to be rewarded with the fire of judgment. John xv. 4. " He that abideth not in " the vine, is caſt forth as a branch, and is burned." Heb. x. 25. " Not forſaking the aſſembling of ourſelves toge- " ther, as the manner of ſome is." St. Auguſtin, Serm. 11. on Math. xii. 32. makes it the ſin againſt the Holy Ghoſt. Schiſmatics are to be conſidered as *exotics*. Matth. xv. 13. " Every plant that my heavenly Father hath not planted, " ſhall be rooted up." They are *withered branches*. John xv. 6. *Falſe brethren*. 2 Cor. ii. 26. " Falſe brethren " unawares brought in." Gal. ii. 4. Matth. vii. 15. " Beware of falſe prophets, that come to you in ſheep's " clothing, but inwardly they are ravening wolves. Ye " ſhall know them by their fruits." Acts xx. 29. " Grievous " wolves enter in, not ſparing the flock." Matth. xxiv. 11. " Many falſe prophets ſhall ariſe, and ſhall deceive many." 1 John iii. 14. " He that loveth not, abideth in death. " Whoſoever hateth his brother, is a murderer; and ye " know that no murderer hath eternal life abiding in him." 1 Tim. vi. 3. " If any man teach otherwiſe, and conſent " not to wholeſome words, even to the words of our Lord

" Jeſus Chriſt, and the doctrine which is according unto " godlineſs, he is proud, knowing nothing, but doating " about queſtions and ſtrifes of words, whereof cometh " envy, ſtrife, railings, evil ſurmiſings, perverſe diſputings " (or, gallings one of another) of men of corrupt minds, " and deſtitute of the truth, ſuppoſing that gain is godli- " neſs: from ſuch withdraw thyſelf." Tit. i. 10. " Many " unruly and vain talkers and deceivers." 1 John v. 14. " This is the confidence we have in him, that if we aſk any " thing according to his will, he heareth us.—Woe unto " that man by whom the offence cometh." Mark ix. 42. " It were better that a milſtone were hanged about his neck, " &c." Phil. iv. 21. " Salute every ſaint in Chriſt Jeſus; " in his body the church." Tit. iii. 15. " Greet them that " *love* us in the faith." Heb. xiii. 24. " Salute all them " that have the rule over you, and all the ſaints." 1 Pet. v. 14. " Greet ye one another with a kiſs of CHARITY. " Peace be with you all that are in Chriſt Jeſus." As to thoſe who are not in Chriſt Jeſus, we are bound not to ſalute them. 2 John 10. " Whoſoever tranſgreſſeth, and " abideth not in the doctrine of Chriſt, hath not God—If " there come any unto you, and bring not this doctrine, " receive him not into your houſes, neither bid him God " ſpeed." Communion with them is forbidden, Gal. v. 12. " I would they were even cut off that trouble you, ἀναλασα- " λοντες, who diſturb, raiſe factions, overturn, deſtroy." 2 Theſſ. iii. 6. " Now we command you, brethren, in the " name of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, that ye withdraw your- " ſelves from every BROTHER that walketh diſorderly, " (ἀτακτως, breaking his rank) and not after the TRADI- " TION that he received from us." v. 14. " And if any " man obey not our word by this epiſtle, note that man, " and have no company with him, that he may be aſhamed; " yet count him not an enemy, but admoniſh him as a " brother." 2 Pet. iii. 17. " Ye therefore, beloved, ſeeing " ye know theſe things before, beware leſt ye alſo being led " away with the error of the wicked, fall from your own " ſtedfaſtneſs. But grow in grace, and in the knowledge

" of our Lord and Saviour Jeſus Chriſt." Rom. xvi. 17. " Now I beſeech you, brethren, mark them which cauſe " diviſions and offences contrary to the doctrine which ye " have learned, and avoid them. For they that are ſuch " ſerve not our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, but their own belly; " and by good words and fair ſpeeches deceive the hearts " of the ſimple. For your obedience is come abroad unto " all men." Tit. iii. 10. " A man that is an heretic after " the firſt and ſecond admonition, reject; knowing that he " that is ſuch is ſubverted, and ſinneth, being condemned " of himſelf: ἐξεστραπται, he is turned out of the way. Such are to be claſſed with heathens and publicans. Matth. xviii. 17. " If he hear not the CHURCH, let him " be unto thee as an heathen man and a publican." Luke xi. 23. " He that is not with me, is againſt me; and he " that gathereth not with me, ſcattereth." Communion was forbidden with Korah. Numb. xvi. 26. " Depart, I " pray you, from the tents of theſe wicked men, and touch " nothing of theirs, leſt ye be conſumed in all their ſins." All that eat of the ſacrifices of ſuch are abominable. Hoſ. ix. 4. is ſpoken of the ſchiſmatical ten tribes and their offerings. 1 Cor. i. 10. " I beſeech you, brethren, " by the name of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, that ye all ſpeak " the ſame thing, and that there be no diviſions (Gr. " SCHISMS) among you." Eph. iv. 2. " Forbearing one " another in love; endeavouring to keep the unity of the " Spirit in the bond of peace."

Inſtances of Schiſmatics, &c. puniſhed.

Satan firſt broke the unity in heaven, and was caſt down to hell. Hatred is oppoſite to love. Cain, being of that wicked one, fell into envy, and ſlew his brother, in a quarrel which was altogether of a religious kind. He went out from the preſence of God, i. e. from the church, as it then was, a fugitive, and a vagabond in the earth; and built a city, in a ſtate of ſeparation from that part of his family in which the church was continued in the line of Seth. The ſchiſm of Cain was continued till the flood came, and de-

ſtroyed them all. Corruption became general, through the intermixture of the members of the church with the poſterity of Cain, the people of the ſchiſm. The crime of Corah and his company was wholly that of ſchiſm: they ſunk into the pit. Jeroboam and the ten tribes, who ſet up the calves againſt the one altar at Jeruſalem, to ſecure their new government, were deſtroyed and extirpated for ever. The man of God (1 Kings xiii. 8, 9) who was ſent thither, was neither to eat nor drink at Bethel, the conventicle of the calf; but he did, and was ſlain for it (ver. 22.) It cannot be, that ſpiritual things ſhould be common with the church and ſchiſm, when the communion even of earthly things was ſo ſtrictly prohibited. The people of the Samaritan ſchiſm, who ſeparated from the two tribes of Judah and Benjamin, were numbered with the Heathens. Matth. x. 5. "Go not into the way of the Gentiles, and into any city "of the Samaritans enter ye not." 2 Chron. xxvi. 21. Uzziah, though king, for intruding into the prieſt's office, was ſtruck with a leproſy, and cut off from the houſe of the Lord.

Images deſcribing Schiſm and its conſequences.

Col. ii. 19. The church is a body, holding with "the "head, from which the whole, by means of joints and "bands, having nouriſhment miniſtred, and knit together, "increaſeth with the increaſe of God." The Spirit is from the head to all the members; ſo that if any member is ſeparated from the body, it muſt loſe the life of the body.

2. When a bough is ſeparated from a tree, it no longer partakes of the life from the root. When it is cut off, it is ſoon withered; and when it is withered, its end is to be burned.

3. A ray of light ſhines by its communication with the ſun: when it is cut off from that communication with the ſource of light, it ſhines no longer.

4. It is the ſame with a ſtream of water, which is ſoon dried up, when it communicates no longer with its fountain.

5. To be joined to any but the bridegroom of the church, is the ſin of ſpiritual adultery; by which the members of Chriſt are made the members of an harlot. The chaſte dove has but one mate: one family are in one houſe.

6. The ark of Noah was a figure of the church: there can be therefore no ſalvation out of the church, becauſe there could be none out of the ark.

7. The ſeamleſs coat of Chriſt is not to be divided. 1 Kings xi. 30, 31. The prophet divides his coat, to ſignify the ſchiſm that ſhould be among the tribes. Chriſt's coat was providentially not divided, to ſignify the unity that ought to be preſerved in his church. We are to put on Chriſt entire; if the garment is torn, it muſt betray our nakedneſs.

8. Rahab was ordered to gather all her friends into her houſe, that they might be ſaved: if any were found out of it, they were to periſh. Joſh. ii. 18.

9. The Paſchal Lamb was to be eaten in *one* houſe: none of it was to be caſt out.

10. The old Jeruſalem was a pattern of the new: there was one temple, and one altar; all the reſt of the world were without.

11. The church of Chriſt is a fold of ſheep, under the protection of the ſhepherd: if the ſheep ſtrays, it is in the way of the wolf.

Texts for Love and Unity, reſpecting the Church.

Epheſ. iv. 4, 5. "There is one body, one ſpirit, one "baptiſm." Chriſt and the Father are one—theſe three are one—Chriſtians are to be one as they are. Pſal. lxviii. 7. God maketh men to be of one mind in a houſe. *In domo Dei, in eccleſiæ Chriſti, unanimes habitant, concordes et ſimplices perſeverant.* Matth. xviii. 19. "If two of you ſhall AGREE "touching any thing that they ſhall aſk, it ſhall be done for "them of my Father which is in heaven. For where two "or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in "the midſt of them." But how can he agree with any one, who is at variance with the body of the church, and

with the whole fraternity? Chriſt was with the three in the furnace, who praiſed him with one heart, and one voice. He was with two Apoſtles in priſon, and brought them out. Matth. v. 23. "When you ſtand praying, forgive, if you "have any thing againſt any one, that your heavenly Father "may forgive you." So again—"offer not your gift till "you are firſt reconciled to your brother"—much more to the church itſelf. Peace was the legacy which Chriſt left to his church—"love one another."—"See that ye fall not "out by the way."—"Though we have all faith, yet without "love we are nothing."—"He that abideth in love, abideth "God, and God in him:" and we have no viſible way of abiding in God, but by abiding with the church, with which he is preſent—"Lo, I am with you always, even to the "end of the world." The working of miracles would avail nothing, without love keeping the commandments. "All the law and the prophets are fulfilled in this, Thou "ſhalt love the Lord thy God, and thy neighbour as thy-"ſelf." Acts iv. 32. "The company of thoſe that believed "were of one heart, and of one mind." So when the Spirit deſcended, "they were all with one accord in one "place." They were ordered to remain together in Jeruſalem, where the viſible church was, till they were endued with power from on high. John xvii. 20. Chriſt prayeth for all thoſe that ſhall believe—that they may be *one*—that the world might thence believe that God had ſent him—putting the proof of his miſſion, and the teſtimony of his religion, on the unity of his diſciples. How great, then, muſt be the offence of expoſing his religion to the contempt and diſbelief of the world, by making diviſions in his church!

Schiſm in the ſpiritual body of the church, is a greater ſcandal than a corruption in manners; as in the natural body, a wound, or ſolution of continuity, is worſe than a corrupt humour. Bacon's Sentences, V. III. p. 295.

CON-

CONTROVERSY.

SOME RULES FOR THE STUDY OF IT.

I. STRIP the book of its trappings. Collect the arguments urged by the author, either for his own ſcheme, or againſt yours. Arrange them methodically; ſtate them briefly, clearly, and fairly.

II. Mark diligently, and note down *conceſſions* made unawares in different parts of the work, which weaken or deſtroy the arguments on the other ſide.

III. Diſcover his *drift* and *deſign*; to what ſect he belongs; who are his friends; who applaud him; and who are applauded by him: whence he fetches his arguments, &c.

IV. Throw out what is nothing to the purpoſe, and fix upon the point on which the diſpute turns. Find out the *jugulum cauſæ*, where one good ſtroke will do more than many pages of lax argumentation. A controvertiſt ſhould be trained as the Arabians train a falcon, to faſten upon the *throat* of the gazell, and there ſtick till the creature drops. See Goldſmith III. 85.

V. Examine whether the opinion *contended* for be not clogged with more difficulties, and liable to more objections, than the opinion *oppoſed*.

VI. In writing controverſy, go as far as you can with your antagoniſt; join with, and commend what is right in him. He that would do *good* by what he ſays, muſt oppoſe and contradict as little as poſſible; muſt make all allowances, and take things in the beſt light. He muſt avoid all reproachful language, all that is ſarcaſtical or biting. This never did good from the pulpit or the preſs. The ſofteſt words make the deepeſt impreſſion.

VOLTAIRE.

2 Cor. ii. 11. *We are not ignorant of his devices.*

I. VOLTAIRE ſcoffs at religion, from the abuſes and corruptions of it among the Heathens. It ſhould be ſhewn, by a true ſtate of the caſe, how things were from the beginning, that it may be ſeen which was the original, and which the copy; how it happened that there was ſuch a ſimilitude between the true and the falſe; a ſimilitude extending to all the nations of the earth; by which it is demonſtrated, that as there was once one original language, of which all other languages were dialectical, ſo one and the ſame religion was once univerſal to all mankind. The Heathens carried off, what they afterwards corrupted by tradition more early than the written law. Voltaire turns all the errors of the copy to the reproach of the original; gives priority to the copy; and ſneers at Jewiſh and Chriſtian inſtitutions under the cover of terms belonging to the Heathen. He finds circumciſion among the Egyptians before Abraham; and derives baptiſm from the Indians, practiſing religious ablutions in the river Ganges. His object is to be rid of truth under the name of error; and to this all his artifices are directed.

II. With this view, the abuſes among the profeſſors of Chriſtianity, ſuch as bitter controverſies, wars, perſecutions, maſſacres, ſuperſtitions, and legendary miracles of Rome, are all laid to the ſcore of their religion, (though they aroſe in fact only from the corruption of it) as if religion produced nothing but bad fruits. If truth is diſgraced by vice and hypocriſy, as it ever was and will be, he reports it to be in itſelf good for nothing. Falſe logic confounds things; true

true logic diſtinguiſhes properly: the former is the logic of the diſhoneſt; the latter of the wiſe and learned.

III. Works done at the command of God, are conſidered as done without his command, and then exclaimed againſt as ſevere and cruel. The executioner is guilty of no crime, when felons are lawfully condemned by their judge: much leſs when the ſentence is from the Judge of all the earth. Earthquakes and peſtilences ſlay indiſcriminately, men, women, and children: but who accuſes God of injuſtice on that account? All the miſtakes and ſtretches of authority are magnified and ſwelled out with all his rhetoric, to make authority itſelf odious, [or transfer it by degrees to the hands of his friends; and all the world now ſees how they uſe it.] What a ſtrange appearance things will take, when we tell ſome circumſtances of a ſtory, and conceal the reſt! If we tell of David's ſin, as Voltaire delights to do, and ſuppreſs the ſentence and the puniſhment paſſed upon it: for thus the Bible, which forbids murder and adultery, is made to encourage them.

IV. He ridicules the cuſtoms and manners of old times, becauſe they do not agree with thoſe of the preſent age. The ſame faults may be found with Homer, whoſe wiſdom is yet very juſtly admired. Emblematical actions of the prophets, without their ſenſe and meaning, may be made to appear ſtrange and unreaſonable; but are of great force and propriety when the reaſon is added. Tell the ſtory of Jonah and the whale, independent of all other things; or throw it into the heap, among the wonders of Zoroaſter and Lomonocodom, and it will be rejected, together with them. But when it is conſidered that our Saviour himſelf confirmed the truth of it, and made his uſe of it; that life, death, the reſurrection, and the eternal ſalvation of mankind, are the moſt intereſting ſubjects we know of, and merit every poſſible wonder of nature to explain to us the nature of them, the caſe is altered. What would be incredible, without the ſequel of Chriſt's reſurrection added to it, and conſidered with

with it, becomes juſt and reaſonable: and thus every fair critic will conſider it.

V. He collects induſtriouſly all the ſlips, blunders, and abſurdities of commentators and defenders, and ſo endeavours to depreciate their labours, and render them contemptible, and religion through them: while all the excellent things a man hath ſaid are overlooked, becauſe he hath ſaid ſome things that are weak.

VI. Difference of opinion, diviſions, &c. do not prove that there is no ſuch thing as truth; but rather that ſome men do not rightly *underſtand* it, and that others do not *like* it. When a man hates the wiſdom of the Scripture, we hold it impoſſible that he can underſtand it. Truth will never enter, where there is not the love of truth. 2 Theſſ. ii. 10. "They received not the love of the truth, that they "might be ſaved." Rom. iii. 3. "What if ſome did not "believe? Shall their unbelief make the faith of God "without effect?"

VII. The ſtiff-neckedneſs of the Jews is uſed as a handle againſt their law. The reaſon ſhould be given why God choſe ſuch a people: why he gave them ſuch a law. They are cenſured for their hatred of other nations: but they were taught to hate and avoid their idolatry; and with idolaters that hatred was unpardonable. He is always railing at the Jews, always vindicating the Heathens: he abſolutely denies it to be poſſible, that Trajan, Titus, and Antoninus, each good men, could ever be guilty of perſecution: but when a man's principles oblige him to deny facts, it is a ſign he is on very bad ground. The ſuppoſed ignorance of the Jews has been much aggravated, by men who appear to have been more ignorant than they. A true and fair account of them ſhould be given.

VIII. To anſwer what is ſaid againſt myſteries, the true nature of a myſtery ſhould be ſhewn. So far as myſteries

ſignify

ſignify doctrines above the reaſon of man, they are unavoidable, if God is pleaſed to tell us any thing about himſelf, and the things of an inviſible world. So far as myſteries ſignify *parables*, where truth is both hidden and explained (hidden from ſome, and explained to others) under the veil of material things, they are vehicles of inſtruction worthy of all admiration.

IX. Ridicule, and ſcorning, and reading with a view to ſneer, are ſymptoms of a very bad diſpoſition. Prov. xiv. 6. "A ſcorner ſeeketh wiſdom and findeth it not." All ſcorn is from contempt; all contempt is from pride; and pride prevents improvement; ſo the ſcorner findeth no wiſdom: the proud mind is ſo full of itſelf, that there is no room for any thing elſe. He that hateth another, is never ſo well pleaſed as when he can make him and his actions appear ridiculous: this is the never-failing effect of hatred and malice: and however incredible it may ſound, we are certain it is a poſſible thing for man to *hate God*; to hate his ways and his word; and in that caſe he will proceed as aforeſaid. In Rom. i. 31. the Heathens are ſaid to have been Θεος ϛγεῖς, "haters of God:" and ver. 25. to have "changed the "truth of God into a lye:" and Pſal. lxxxi. 15. ſpeaks of the "haters of the Lord." If there be any ſuch perſons now, as there undoubtedly have been formerly, Mr. Voltaire might be one of them; and all good men who read his bitter ſarcaſms againſt the people of God, the church of God, the providence of God, the word of God, and in ſhort of every thing that belongs to him, may be left to judge for themſelves. Every truth, however high and ſacred, may be repreſented under ſome low and ridiculous idea; but this is no teſt.

X. When an author writes to the paſſions of mankind, inſtead of addreſſing himſelf to their reaſon, weak proofs will have great weight: the work may be ſometimes done without any proofs: he wants none, who *follows the worſe* while he *ſees the better*; a weakneſs to which all men are ſubject,

ſubject, when paſſion has the dominion over them. Would a man uſe the meretricious arts of telling tales and novels, to *inflame* and *corrupt*, if he could uſe reaſon to convince? Why does he act thus, but becauſe he is appealing to that corrupt judge, which every man carries about in his own breaſt; who is ſo eaſily cheated and bribed to favour the adverſe party?

XI. The foundation of the New Teſtament being laid in the Old Teſtament, it is impoſſible to vilify the Old without ſtriking at the New. Chriſt and his Apoſtles vouch for the Old Teſtament as the word of God: they appeal to it and build upon it. When therefore we ſee men at this work, we may be aſſured their deſign is to overturn Chriſtianity.

XII. The objects of infidels and unfaithful critics againſt the inſpiration of the *language* of the Scripture, ſhould be obviated.—See what *Middleton* and *Warburton* have thrown out.—The Scripture is not offered to us as the *ſenſe* or *ſentiment* of God, but as the *word of God*; communicated to us through perſons, 2 Pet. iv. 21. "who *ſpake* as they were "moved by the Holy Ghoſt." It is not only againſt the expreſs declarations of the Scripture, but it is falſe philoſophy to ſuppoſe that an inſpired man ſpeaks his own words. Luke xxi. 15. "I will give you a *mouth* and wiſdom." That the divine ſpirit does actually inſpire words, is demonſtrated by the gift of *languages* to the Apoſtles, which conſiſt of *words only*.

The beſt way to confute and expoſe unbelievers, would be, not to anſwer their cavils, (which are without end) but to carry the war into the enemy's quarters; to ſhew plainly what infidelity is, whence it comes, how it maintains itſelf, &c. See *Maſſillon* Carême III. 277. The *Hiſtory of Infidelity* would be a valuable work [beginning with the *Heathens*, and coming down to apoſtatiſing Chriſtians.]

NOTE.

NOTE.

IF Biſhop *Horne* had drawn out theſe reflections, he would have given us a compleat character of Voltaire, as an enemy to Chriſtianity; which, from ſuch a hand, would have been a choice work, both edifying and entertaining. But as no ſuch thing is found among his manuſcripts, the Editor of theſe Extracts has attempted a ſketch, from his own knowledge of that author's writings.

The reaſon of *Voltaire* was to right reaſon what a monkey is to a man. The geſticulations of that animal provoke even a wiſe man to laughter; while his head at the ſame time is filled with miſchief, and his heart is incapable of any one good affection. He had an imagination which inclined him to the writing of plays: his mind is therefore always upon a ſtage, and his object is to catch the attention of an audience rather by mimickry than by ſenſe and argument. With a ſtrong diſpoſition to evil, he was no friend to reſtraint of any kind: ſo he abhorred all law but the law of *liberty*, which is no law; and all government but the government of *equality*, which is no government: and as religion is the ſupport both of law and government, he hated that worſt of all. He affected a great abhorrence of perſecution, and recommended univerſal toleration; only with deſign to let evil looſe among mankind; of which it required not half his wit to ſee the conſequence. Give equal liberty to a tyger and twenty ſheep: the ſheep will all periſh by degrees, and the tyger will thrive and fatten upon their blood. But he had a farther end in his affected clemency. He trained his readers to a paſſion for toleration, that they might take the ſame diſlike with himſelf to the juſtice of God in the holy Scripture; which juſtice he has frequently arraigned as intolerant; while he artfully imputes its operations to the bigotry and malignity of the Jews. He views the Hebrew nation only on one ſide, to pick out their faults, and make them odious; that when he has brought you to deſpiſe their characters, you may deſpiſe their laws and religion with them. If the people of God

have

have an enemy, Voltaire always finds in that enemy ſomething congenial with himſelf. He therefore takes part with the Egyptians againſt the Jews, with the Heathens againſt the Chriſtians, with the Sectaries againſt the Church, with the Heretics againſt the Scripture, and with Atheiſts againſt God; having expreſsly defended the Atheiſt *Vanini*. He is as fond of levelling in learning as in politics. By making unjuſt aſſociations, and putting things good and bad together, he leaves no value nor ſuperiority in any thing. The Bible makes known to us the exiſtence of angels: but what then? Kings had their couriers; ſo men thought they could do no leſs than give them to their deities. Mercury and Iris were the meſſengers of Heatheniſm; the Perſians had their Peris; the Greeks had their dæmons, &c. In this way he puts truth and error together, till the mind of an unlearned reader, having no touchſtone, is confounded and believes nothing. If Heathens ſpeak with falſehood and malice, he uſes their authority: if they ſay nothing, but treat Chriſtianity with contemptuous ſilence, he uſes that alſo; and thence infers, that the facts of Chriſtianity are of no credit; for had they been true, the Heathens muſt have known them, and had they known them they muſt have confeſſed them. But why ſo? When Mr. Voltaire himſelf knew them without confeſſing them? See with what contemptuous indifference Feſtus, an Heathen, who was upon the ſpot, at the time when the facts of the Goſpel were freſh, ſpeaks of "one Jeſus who was dead, whom Paul "affirmed to be alive." The penmen of the Scriptures, being above all fears and ſuſpicions, make no ſecret of theſe things; but ſhew us without reſerve how ignorant and fooliſh people deſpiſed and neglected the Goſpel then, as they do now.

Mr. Voltaire is as unſound in his metaphyſics as in his divinity. He tells us the belief of the exiſtence of the human ſoul depends only on revelation: and conſequently, when revelation is ſet aſide, man is left without a ſoul. So far as the ſoul of man is a ſubject of philoſophy, men diſpute about that as about other things. He collects their

ſophiſms

ſophiſms and contradictions, and puts them together, till the whole ſubject appears ridiculous: and in this way he rids himſelf of every thing ſerious; as *Bayle*, his maſter, did before him.

He is very copious and frequent as a commentator on the Bible, on which few writers have beſtowed more attention: but his method is this; he takes a paſſage of the Scripture which he diſtorts and perverts by every art of miſrepreſentation; and when he thinks the Chriſtian reader is entangled paſt recovery, he finiſhes all with a pious ſneer—"but, theſe are things we muſt not look into—God does not write like us weak mortals—his wiſdom is ſurrounded with clouds, obſcure and reſpectable." However, witty as he thinks himſelf, his wits often forſake him, and he talks like a child or an idiot, when he gives his opinion of the doctrines or inſtitutions of Chriſtianity. The fall of man, he ſays, is the plaiſter we put upon all the maladies of the ſoul and the body: as if we ſhould ſay, the fall of a man from a ladder, is the plaiſter we put upon his broken leg. Speaking about baptiſm, he tells us, "men who are always governed by their ſenſes, eaſily imagine, that when the body is waſhed, the ſoul is waſhed." But this is the very thing, which men who are governed by their ſenſes never did imagine, nor ever can; becauſe the waſhing of the ſoul is not an object of ſenſe but of faith. To make light of this ſacrament, he feigns abſurd difficulties in regard to the adminiſtration of it; as, whether a perſon under neceſſity in the deſerts of Arabia might be baptiſed *with ſand*; or, if there were no clear water, whether he might be baptiſed with *muddy water*. Such criticiſms as theſe naturally remind us, that the devil never *loved holy water*.

It is an undeniable fact, that the world is full of wickedneſs: but if we complain of it, as ariſing from the corruption of nature, Mr. *Voltaire* always finds religion worſe than nature. Men are found to eat one another. How ſavage is the practice! What a diſgrace to human nature! But, not at all, ſays Mr. *Voltaire*; it aroſe from the cuſtom of hunting, and hunting is natural to man. When men

have

have hunted down ſtags and bears, they eat them: even ſo, when they had hunted down their enemies, how natural to eat them too! But if you hold it abſolutely wicked and deteſtable for man to eat the fleſh of man, he finds an order for it in the Bible. In Ezek. xxxix. he hears God promiſing his people, that they ſhall eat, not only the horſes of their enemies, but their enemies themſelves; even their horſemen and ſoldiers: then he adds, *cela eſt poſitif.* But in the paſſage he refers to, thoſe words are not addreſſed to the people: they are part of a proclamation to every *feathered fowl* and every *beaſt of the field,* to come and devour the fleſh of the ſlain.

The man who does not ſee the wiſdom of God in the Bible, can never be expected to ſee much of his providence in the affairs of this world: he is accordingly very ingenious in his ways of evading it. There is an accurſed malady, unknown to the Heathens of antiquity, with which Chriſtians are viſited for their wickedneſs; and dreadful havock it makes among the ſpecies. He that can impute all this to chance, might as well believe that gibbets grow naturally out of the brakes upon Hounſlow-heath. But Mr. *Voltaire* proves it never could be intended for a judgment, becauſe it firſt began in ſome ſmall iſlands, where men and women lived together in perfect ſimplicity and innocence. Where and from whom he learned this piece of hiſtory, he does not tell us: but we may ſuppoſe, it was where he learned to read the prophet Ezekiel.

The religion of Mr. *Voltaire*, by which I mean his ſpeculations about the Deity (for he had no other) was, as nearly as we can diſcover, the ſame with that of the Atheiſt *Vanini.* Matter being animated with immaterial qualities, this animation of the world is the Deity; and man is a part of the animated maſs, with nothing within-ſide of him diſtinct from the animation of his body. Life is but as the active force of any other piece of machinery: which, as it was nothing before we were born, will be nothing after we are dead. Which doctrine he thus illuſtrates: Vulcan, as Homer relates, made certain tripods, which had a motion

of their own upon their wheels, and came and went of themſelves as occaſion required. But, ſays he, Vulcan would have been reckoned a mean artiſt, if he had been obliged to put a little blackſmith withinſide to move his tripods. In like manner, man being but a perfect piece of machinery, there is no need of a ſoul, like the *petite perſonne* within the tripod, to give him motion; and it is a reflection upon the Deity to ſuppoſe it.

As to the learning of *Voltaire*, it was nothing extraordinary: he had the way of making a great figure with a little. He affected univerſality; but it does not appear that he was deep in any one ſcience: and though he was a ready poet, his mind was either too vitiated, or too narrow, to comprehend the ſublimities of our Shakeſpeare, whom he held in utter contempt; and was therefore himſelf no true genius. He had a great and quick flow of words; he could put a high varniſh upon ſhallow ſenſe; by which the eyes of his readers are dazzled, as by a picture purpoſely placed in a falſe light: he had the dexterity of a juggler in confounding the diſtinctions of good and evil; and giving to truth the appearance of falſehood. Before he died, he had a foretaſte of the ſucceſs of his writings; and, with the aſſurance of a prophet, foretold that *Age of Reaſon* and illumination, which is now come. As Simon the Sorcerer is ſaid to have *bewitched the people of Samaria*, and deceived them into a high opinion of his own power and wiſdom; ſo have the works of *Voltaire* unchriſtianed the French nation, and produced all the horrors of their revolution. Try his principles by the effects of them. His tender love of toleration has ended in a worſe than Decian perſecution: his liberty has generated a tyranny more abſolute and cruel than that of Turkey or Algiers; his declamations againſt kings, as the enemies of peace, have produced ſuch tumults and wars as never were known, and have nearly put the whole world into arms. This is the man, of whom the preſent philoſophers of France now boaſt, that his writings have prevailed to the extirpation of Chriſtianity. Twelve Apoſtles, they ſay, were neceſſary to propagate it, but one *Voltaire* was ſufficient to overthrow it.

But

But how little do they ſee into the merits of the cauſe! The Goſpel is a ſyſtem of faith; contrary to the wiſdom of man, which is without faith; and its principles are ſo ſubverſive of his paſſions and prejudices, that his nature will not yield to arguments; and it was therefore found neceſſary to overpower, and take his reaſon captive, by the force of miracles, before he could be prevailed upon to receive it: and the belief of its doctrines has been ſupported in the world from that day to this by the belief of its miracles. Let but this belief be removed, and man falls back naturally into his old corruption. Chriſtianity had drawn him forcibly up hill; but his own gravity carries him down again; or, if the hand of man is wanting to ſet him agoing, a very weak hand will be ſufficient. When a candle burns, and gives light to a houſe, many wonderful things contribute to the phænomenon. The fat of an animal is the work of the Creator; or, the wax of the bee, is made by his teaching; the wick is from the vegetable wool of a ſingular exotic tree; much labour of man is concerned in the compoſition; and the elements that inflame it are thoſe by which the world is governed. But after all this apparatus, a child or a fool may put it out; and then boaſt that the family are left in darkneſs, and are running againſt one another. Such is the mighty achievement of Mr. *Voltaire*; but with this difference, that what is real darkneſs is called illumination: and there is no other between the two caſes.

HINTS TO THE LEARNED,

ON EVIL-SPEAKING, RAILING, AND REPROACHING, IN THEIR WRITINGS.

THIS practice is unreaſonable upon all accounts. It is *needleſs*, becauſe mild words will expreſs the ſame thing full as well, and to better purpoſe. It is commonly *unjuſt*, loading men with more blame than it can be proved that they deſerve; for every man who thinks wrong, is not a *fool*, nor is every man who acts wrong a *rogue*. It is *uncharitable*, as making the worſt of every thing, and ſhewing no mercy. It is *miſchievous*, as exciting the moſt pernicious of paſſions, and ſo becoming anſwerable for their effects. Upon the bench, it turns juſtice into abuſe; in the pulpit, it turns zeal into animoſity; in the mouth of a friend, it turns reproof into malignity. In diſputation, it is prejudicial to the ſpeaker, inflaming his own paſſions, ſo that he cannot make the beſt of his arguments. It is prejudicial to the hearer, becauſe arguments, even when made the beſt of, yet ſo propoſed, will never be admitted by him, unleſs he be a prodigy indeed of candour and meekneſs. It is prejudicial to truth, becauſe ſtrength of paſſion is generally thought to indicate in an advocate a diſtruſt of his cauſe, and a ſcarcity of proof. It is a practice given into ſometimes through ſudden anger; ſometimes through inveterate hatred; ſometimes through revenge for an injury received; ſometimes through ſelf-conceit and contempt of others; ſometimes through envy; ſometimes through ambition and intereſt; ſometimes through mere malignity, to cheriſh a *cacoëthes* of this kind, either inbred or acquired by cuſtom; ſometimes out of wantonneſs, and ſometimes through negligence and inadvertency. It is directly oppoſite to the very nature and tenour of our religion; it is expreſsly condemned and prohibited

hibited by it as evil. No practice hath ſeverer puniſhments denounced againſt it; it is in itſelf the ſymptom of a weak, diſtempered, and diſordered mind; a ſtream flowing from a bitter ſpring; a black ſmoke iſſuing from a volcano; it is the ſure ſign of a mean ſpirit, and low breeding; all wiſe, honeſt, and ingenuous perſons deteſt and fly from him that uſeth it; who, being regarded as a hater of mankind, is accordingly hated by mankind, and one way or other fails not to be ſhrewdly requited by them in the end.

With regard to the examples ſometimes alledged of the prophets, Apoſtles, and our Saviour Chriſt himſelf, it is to be conſidered, that they had a ſpecial commiſſion, and a ſpecial illumination to diſcern the proper objects on which to exerciſe it. The whole tenour of their lives and actions demonſtrated, that they ſpake upon ſuch occaſions, as moved not by prejudice, pique, and paſſion, but by a view to the glory of God, the good of men, and the neceſſity of the caſe. And whenever only their own private credit and intereſt were concerned, they opened not their mouths, unleſs to bleſs their perſecutors.

When the crimes of men are ſuch as call for a ſeverity of language, it may be uſed by him who is commiſſioned for that purpoſe, upon a juſt cauſe and clear evidence, for the ſervice of God, the maintenance of truth, the vindication of innocence, the preſervation of public juſtice and peace, the amendment of our neighbour himſelf, or the preſervation of others from contagion. And then we muſt be careful to obſerve the meaſures preſcribed by truth, equity, and humanity; ſpeaking no worſe of a man than his actions, according to the moſt favourable conſtruction of them, deſerve, and the cauſe abſolutely requireth.

See an excellent chapter in Taylor's *Worthy Communicant*, on *Speaking Good of our Neighbour*, p. 194. See alſo a Sermon of Dr. Jortin.

Non amo eorum indolem, qui nec in laudibus nec in probris modum ullum ſervant. Laudanda, ſine invidiâ, quæ laudibus digna ſunt; improbanda, ſine malignitate, quæ a ver diſſentiunt. Le Clerc Art. Crit. Vol. III. p. 274.

Some Conſiderations on Mr. LOCKE's Scheme of deriving Government from an *Original Compact*.

1. HOOKER allows, that "to fathers within their private families, *nature* hath given a *ſupreme power*; for which cauſe," ſaith he, "we ſee throughout the world, even from the foundation thereof, all men have been taken as *lords* and lawful *kings* in their own houſes*." He alſo thinks it probable, with Ariſtotle, that "as the chiefeſt perſon in every houſehold was always as it were a *king*; ſo when numbers of houſeholds joined together in civil ſocieties, *kings* were the firſt kind of governors amongſt them." The queſtion is, how theſe civil governors came by their power over a number of families diſperſed, as mankind increaſed, and independent of one another? Here is ſuppoſed to be a neceſſity for *compact* to take place, in the appointment of one common head; and the chiefs of the ſeveral families are the *peers* between whom it is imagined to have been made, for their mutual intereſt and welfare.

As mankind multiplied, they were obliged to ſeparate and diſperſe; which they did under their *natural* rulers the heads of families, clans, or tribes. This would fill the earth with *little* governments; and as there was land enough for them, who needed only to till the ground, and feed their flocks, thus they would continue, till quarrels aroſe, and one clan ſubdued others by force, and the *larger* governments aroſe

* The ſame ſentiment is expreſſed by Mr. *Addiſon* with his uſual accuracy and elegance. "The obedience of children to their parents is the baſis of all government, and is ſet forth as the meaſure of that obedience which we owe to thoſe whom Providence hath placed over us." Spect. No. 389.

by

by conqueſt, ſwallowed up the leſſer into themſelves, and then contended with and overthrew each other. In the Xth chapter of Geneſis, we have an account of the families, clans, or *leſſer* governments with which the earth was overſpread, by the deſcendants of the ſons of Noah: and at ver. 8, 9, 10, we find the kingdom or *larger* government of Babel ariſing by means of Nimrod, a *mighty one*, i. e. a ſubduer, a conqueror, a hunter, or perſecutor and oppreſſor. Soon after aroſe Aſhur, the founder of the Aſſyrian monarchy, which afterwards fell into that of Babylon, and became univerſal: thence it paſſed to the Perſians, Grecians, and Romans; and ſo down to the preſent ſtate of things in this world. And all this without any neceſſity of ſuppoſing an *original compact*, and without any ſign of ſuch compact appearing in hiſtory.

Mr. Locke aſſerts the free conſent of every individual neceſſary to be had in founding governments; but ſoon after tells us, ſuch conſent is "next to impoſſible to be had." So that, according to his own account, his hypotheſis ſtands on a ſuppoſition "next to impoſſible" to be realized; indeed, we may venture to ſay, *altogether* impoſſible, for the reaſons he himſelf aſſigns. B. II. ch. 8.

The original compact being ſuppoſed to be made, each individual conſents from thenceforth to be determined by the *majority* of the ſociety. But as the majority may exceed the minority only by a ſingle vote, conſequently half the ſociety may be *enſlaved* by the other half, (that is, in fact, by the will of a ſingle perſon, the caſting voter) which ſeems to be an *infringement on liberty*, to which men born *free* and *equal* might ſcruple to ſubmit.

Mr. Locke ſays, "no man can ſubmit himſelf to the arbitrary power of another." B. II. ch. 11. Then can he not ſubmit himſelf to any government whatſoever: for in every government the *legiſlature* is arbitrary, and is not bound by its own laws, which it can repeal, alter, diſpenſe with, deny the benefit of habeas corpus, keep a man in Newgate, take his life by act of attainder, &c.

His farther reaſon (why no man can ſubmit himſelf to the arbitrary power of another) is, that no man can give what he hath not, viz. a power over his own life. How then came any government poſſeſſed of a power of life and death? Divine right ſurely muſt come in here: what elſe can give to another that power over my life, which I have not in myſelf*?

He farther aſſerteth, that abſolute ſubjection to any form of government is worſe than anarchy, or a ſtate of nature, "as he is in a much worſe condition who is expoſed to the arbitrary will of one man, who has the command of 10,000, than he who is expoſed to the arbitrary power of 100,000 ſingle men." But which is beſt for *the whole* 100,000, that their general or king ſhould now and then command or do an hard thing by one of them, or that they ſhould all be turned looſe to devour each other, *a fortiori*, with regard to a nation, or the whole world, which, in ſuch a caſe, would be an *aceldama*.

He tells us, (B. II. ch. 19) that if a government become arbitrary, it is *diſſolved*; the people are again in a ſtate of

* The author of *an Eſſay on Crimes and Puniſhments*, (one of the firſt pieces in which the politics now prevailing in France were publiſhed to the world) ſeeing that no government can exiſt without a power of life and death, ſuppoſes, that though one man has no power over his life, the aggregate of ſociety may have it; which is the ſame as to ſay, that though one cypher does not make a ſum, a multitude of cyphers may.

According to the plain ſtate of this caſe, Gen. ix. 6. the taking away of man's life without law, is an act of rebellion againſt God, who is the giver of life, and made man in his own image. By himſelf, therefore, power is given to every government to take away the life of man by an act of juſtice, in virtue of a divine law: for the ſame authority which ordains the law, doth in ſo doing ordain power to execute the law, without which the law is nothing; and this we call the power of the *ſword*. This power being original in God, the Apoſtle, *Rom.* xiii. 6. conſiders the civil magiſtrate as the miniſter of God for the execution of the divine law; and that to reſiſt him is to reſiſt the *ordinance of God*: therefore government is the ordinance of God. The argument is plain, and can never be anſwered. In the work above-mentioned, *ſuicide* is conſidered as a *voluntary migration*; as when a man by choice leaves his pariſh, and goes to ſeek his fortune in another!

nature,

nature, and may again proceed to election. 1. Government may paſs from one contending party to another, but its *diſſolution* is a whim and a dream. 2. Diſſolve it in England and Scotland, and ſee when the individuals would agree on another form *?

It is obſervable, that among the inſtances of mal-adminiſtration which diſſolve government, Mr. Locke reckons that of corrupting the repreſentatives, or their electors. "This," he ſays, "is to cut up government by the roots, and poiſon the very fountain of public ſecurity: it is a great breach of truſt, and as *perfect a declaration of a deſign to ſubvert the government as is poſſibly to be met with.* To which if one ſhall add rewards and puniſhments viſibly employed to the ſame end, and all the arts of perverted law made uſe of to take off and deſtroy all that ſtand in the way of ſuch a deſign, and will not comply and conſent to deſtroy the liberties of their country, *it will be paſt doubt what is doing*—and one cannot but ſee, that *he who has once attempted any ſuch thing, cannot any longer be truſted.*" B. II. ch. 19. p. 338. Now had Mr. Locke's principles been univerſally received, and had the good people of England acted up to them, in the days of Sir Robert Walpole, the nation had been a ſcene of confuſion from that time to this †.

Mr.

* Late events have taught us, that when the regular eſtabliſhment of government is deſtroyed, factions ariſe in its ſtead, who murder and plunder one another.

† When the order of the conſtitution is violated, and bad principles are introduced, the government does not fall to pieces, but the different parts of it maintain themſelves as well as they can by mutual encroachments; the commons, by taking ſomething from the crown, and the crown, by ſubſtituting pecuniary influence, to ſupply what it loſes of its lawful power. "We may give (ſays Mr. *Hume*) to this influence what name we pleaſe; we may call it by the invidious name of corruption and dependence: but ſome degree, and ſome kind of it, are *inſeparable from the very nature of the Conſtitution, and neceſſary to the preſervation of our own mixed government.*" I. 67. This ſeems to be the true account of the matter: and it hath appeared in fact, that when the crown hath thought proper to exert itſelf, it has carried every queſtion in the houſe of commons. Mr. Hume was of opinion, that if ever the

Mr. Locke ſays farther, that "till miſchiefs are grown general, &c. the people who are *more diſpoſed to ſuffer* than right themſelves by reſiſtance, are not apt to ſtir." *Ibid.* p. 345. "There is a ſlowneſs and averſion in people to quit their old conſtitution—and whatever provocations have made the crown to be taken from ſome of our princes' heads, they never carried the people ſo far as to place it in another line." p. 340. Here it is curious to ſee how great men differ. Mr. Hume thinks paſſive obedience ſhould be preached, without mentioning any caſe wherein it is to give way to reſiſtance; becauſe the people are far more likely to rebel in the wrong place, than to omit doing it in the right; the bias of human nature being, in the judgment of that acute obſerver of it, towards rebellion. See his reflections on the reign of Charles I. at the cloſe of his hiſtory of that reign. The ſame inference, by the way, follows from what Mr. Locke ſays, p. 340, that when people are oppreſſed, preach *jure divino*, and paſſive obedience, as much as you pleaſe, they will rebel. If this be ſo, we may very ſafely preach it; it can do no hurt to civil liberty. But ſurely conſcience is ſome reſtraint; and if people will rebel as ſoon as rebellion is proper, though you preach obedience, they are in great danger of doing it before it is proper, if you preach reſiſtance.

In the next page, Mr. Locke is again of opinion, that the people are *not* diſpoſed to rebellion. "Great miſtakes in the ruling part, many wrong and inconvenient laws, and all the ſlips of human frailty will be borne by the people without mutiny or murmur." p. 341. Not if they were thoroughly perſuaded, that all power was originally in them, and they might change the legiſlative as often as they pleaſed, but what *wrong and inconvenient laws* had *Moſes* made, or of

the power ſhould devolve to the commons, and a popular government be erected, we ſhall be overwhelmed with faction or tyranny, and "ſuch a violent government cannot long ſubſiſt, but we ſhall at laſt, after infinite convulſions and civil wars, find repoſe in abſolute monarchy, which it would have been happier for us to have eſtabliſhed more peaceably from the beginning. Abſolute monarchy is therefore the eaſieſt death, the true euthanaſia of the Britiſh conſtitution." I. 78.

what

what *ſlips of human frailty* had he been guilty, when *Dathan* and *Abiram* aſſerted a deſign to ſubvert the conſtitution, and to make himſelf *arbitrary*, was ſo plain, that the people muſt ſee it, unleſs he "put out their eyes!" Numb. xvi. 13, 14.

To thoſe who object the confuſion, civil wars, &c. that muſt follow from Mr. Locke's principle, he anſwers, by comparing a ruler, who violates the conſtitution, to a robber, a pirate, a wolf, a polyphemus (p. 343); and is very witty on a ſuppoſition that Ulyſſes, as a prudent man, for the ſake of peace, preached paſſive obedience to his companions in the den, &c. But the caſes are not parallel, as none of his worthies are inveſted with any authority of any kind, to which obedience is due. And, by the compariſons, one would really think nothing was more common than for kings to cut or tear the throats of their ſubjects, and ſuck the blood, as it ran warm from the jugulars.

He who places all power in the people, ſays Mr. Locke, *makes the beſt fence againſt rebellion*. p. 341. How ſo? Why, becauſe the ruler who breaks his truſt, is *properly* the rebel; he does *rebellare*, bring back that war, force, or violence, which it was the deſign of the original compact to drive and to keep away: for rebellion is not againſt *perſons*, but againſt the *authority* lodged in the conſtitution and the laws. But can authority exiſt without a perſon to exiſt in? or can the laws execute themſelves? We have an equal right to take away from the other ſide the *perſons* of *rebels*; then may we leave *rebellion* and *authority*, in the abſtract, to ſettle the matter by themſelves: there will be no bloodſhed between them. *Prerogative* and *privilege*, conſidered in the ſame way, without a crown and a parliament, that is, without any ſubject to inhere in, may be the two ſeconds; and that the combatants may have room enough, let them fight in infinite ſpace. If the right of government be not inherent in the perſons of governors, there can be no ſuch thing as government upon earth *.

To

* This diſtinction between *perſons* and *authority* is plainly calculated to produce changes of government by inſurrections and rebellions. For if authority

To Mr. Locke's ſcheme of founding government upon compact among peers in a ſtate of nature, it had been objected, that men never were in ſuch a ſtate. Mr. Locke is ſo obliging as to favour us with ſome inſtances of men in that ſtate. As firſt, the *Floridans*, *Braſilians*, and *Cheraquees* in America, who it ſeems have no kings, but chuſe leaders as they want them in time of war. (p. 242.) It is probable that they may. But men at the beginning were not placed by their maker in ſo miſerable a ſtate. It is a ſtate, to which, by the loſs of revelation, and other knowledge, through the divine judgments upon them, ſome generations of men have been reduced to run wild, like brutes, in the woods. This is not a ſtate of *nature*, but the moſt *unnatural* ſtate in the world, for creatures made in the image of God. And does a polite philoſopher, in theſe enlightened days, ſend us to ſtudy politics under Cherokee tutors!

A ſecond inſtance is the company that left Sparta, under the conduct of Palantus, whom by a free and equal vote they choſe for their leader. The perſons here alluded to were an extraordinary breed of baſtards, begotten on the women of Sparta by certain young men ſent home to cohabit with them promiſcuouſly, from the Spartan army, detained at the ſiege of Meſſena, under a vow not to return till the city was taken. When the iſſue of this promiſcuous concubinage came to years of maturity, partly having grace enough to be aſhamed of their mothers, and partly afraid of being ſtarved for want of an inheritance from their fathers, they choſe Palantus, the pious author of the advice, for their general, ſeized upon Tarentum, drove out the original inhabitants, ſettled, grew ſeditious, and at laſt baniſhed for ever that ſame Palantus, the cauſe of their birth, and the

thority be not reſident in perſons, then may any perſon ſeize upon it without offence againſt any other perſon. It was actually ſo applied in the laſt century. It is the old diſtinction that raiſed the rebellion againſt Charles I. and has been expreſsly condemned by the laws, which have obliged both *clergy*, *corporations*, and *militia* to "abhor that *traiterous poſition* of taking arms by the king's authority againſt his perſon, or againſt thoſe that are commiſſioned by him.

guide

guide of their peregrinations. How many happy circumſtances muſt concur to bring our poſterity into this ſame Spartan ſtate of nature, in order to erect a free and equal government? I ſay, our *poſterity*; becauſe we ourſelves, having the misfortune to be already born of honeſt parents, muſt deſpair of ſo great a bleſſing*. Two other inſtances produced by Mr. Locke are the founders of Rome and Venice. The former were a gang of robbers; the latter were the inhabitants of Padua, Aquileia, and other cities on the continent of Italy, driven thence by the Goths in the fifth century; conſequently obliged to ſhift as they could, and chuſe governors in their diſtreſs, when they were deprived of their natural ones, in the places where they lived before. There is no queſtion but ſome men have been, and ſome may again, either bring themſelves, or be brought by others, into this ſtate of anarchy; in which caſe, they muſt get out of it as well as they can. But all Mr. Locke's inſtances are of men in an *unnatural* ſtate; to which they were reduced by breaking or being forced away from civil government, which was in the world long before any of theſe inſtances happened. "From the beginning it was not ſo."

Mr. Locke ſays only (p. 250) it is *probable* men were naturally free, and *by their own conſent* ſubmitted to the government of their *father*, and of his *eldeſt ſon* after him, finding the *eaſineſs* and *equality* of it. Here the fact is allowed, and the *compact*, it ſeems, made by the *tacit conſent* of the children. So ſaith Biſhop Hoadley: "If Adam's monarchy were founded upon, and ſupported by the *tacit conſent* of his deſcendants, this amounts to ſuch a *compact* as

* The narrative here referred to is very ſingular, and worth a farther inquiry. The hero of the tale is alſo called *Phalanthus*, and the ſpurious race are called *Partheii*, becauſe they were born of unmarried women. They were engaged in a plot with the *Helots* for cutting off the inhabitants of Sparta, and taking poſſeſſion for themſelves; but the *Helots* betrayed them, and the miſcarrying of this deſign occaſioned their emigration. It is curious to obſerve how fornication and ſedition here go hand in hand, and how both together furniſh Mr. Locke with an example which ſuits with his opinion on the origin of government.

I am

I am defending." See *Finiſhing Stroke*, p. 19. Confounding conſent of *duty* with conſent of *authority*. This did for the golden age: but afterwards when governors grew naughty, "men found it neceſſary to examine more carefully the original and rights of government, (p. 252) and find out ways to reſtrain, &c." So that this was only a *ſecondary* affair, and the original compact between peers in an independent ſtate of nature is given up; only we muſt not ſay the *patria poteſtas* was by *divine right*, but by the *tacit conſent* of the children; which was certainly given, unleſs *crying* could be interpreted into a diſſent *.

Mr. Locke's great argument againſt the patriarchal ſcheme proceeds on a ſuppoſition, that its patrons held an *univerſal monarchy in a right line from Adam*, and deſires to be ſhewn who that monarch now is. But this God never intended. Adam was ruler in his own family; but if a colony went off to a diſtance under one of his ſons, *he* was the ruler *there*, and ſo on: which is ſufficient to ſhew there could be no independent ſtate of nature from the beginning. Afterwards, when conqueſt and uſurpation made confuſion, the general rule for the preſervation of peace and order in the world could only be this, that the poſſeſſor had the right, if nobody could ſhew a better. And people at this day muſt be guided by the conſtitution and laws of their own country, obeying the ſupreme power, wherever it is placed, for conſcience ſake.

But after all, there can be no ſuch thing as any permanent authority in any kind of government; if it be true, as Mr. Locke aſſerts, (p. 255) that a man born under government, is as free as one dropped in the woods; becauſe

* It was argued, that if government were the ordinance of God, and there could be no authority of government but from the conſent of the governed, it would then follow, that the authority of God himſelf muſt be founded upon the conſent of the people. And the advocates for *compact* did ſtill perſiſt, and went ſo far as to aſſert, that God became the God of the Hebrews in virtue of a *contract* which the people made with him at *Horeb*; that is, becauſe the people choſe him. Thus a conſent of duty is turned into a conſent of authority.

though

though his father, by compact, had paſſed over *his* liberty, he could do it only for *himſelf*, not for his children *, who, it ſeems, are free, and conſequently under no obligation to obey God, when he commands them to be ſubject to the powers that be, till they have given their own conſent, by compact with thoſe powers. The man, who, when he comes of age, ſhould act upon this principle, and plead an authority to tranſgreſs the laws becauſe he had never conſented to them, would either receive puniſhment, or be put into confinement as a perſon out of his wits.

A NOTE BY THE EDITOR.

[If a father have promiſed for his ſon, that he ſhall obey the law of God, we are ſure that ſon can never be releaſed from the obligation by any authority of his own. For the moral government of God is as wide as the world; and where the laws of God are known, every man is born ſubject to them: and he will be judged by thoſe laws at laſt. Every civil government is erected in aid to this moral government of God; and thus the peace and ſecurity of the world is preſerved, though the value of government to mankind be ſometimes not known till it is loſt; as men do not know the bleſſing of health till they have been ſick. Authors argue about government, without remembering that they are under revelation. This has been the occaſion of all our diſputes: and we have ſeen from an event univerſally known, that when the principles which human philoſophy has invented are realized, and brought to effect, they are found to have ſo little religion in them, that it is doubted whether they will conſiſt with the being of a God.

It ſeems to have been the deſign of all Mr. Locke's arguments, not to obtain from hiſtory and reaſon the true original of government, nor to teach us how and why it is to be

* This is a contradiction to what Mr. Locke had before aſſerted, concerning *a tacit conſent of the children.*

maintained in the world; but, in a ſuppoſed ſtate of nature, the power of the populace, and the obligation of an imaginary compact, to lay a plauſible foundation for inſurrections and diſſolutions. For this purpoſe, his principles were taken up and circulated. *Price* and *Prieſtley* wrote for them; and all their followers defend them. In the beginning of the preſent revolution in France, one of their friends, who viſited them from England, reported of them in a newspaper, that they were wonderfully enlightened, and *talked like men who had read Locke.* It is probable they might; though *Locke* was tranſmitted to their reading through the writings of *Voltaire.* If what they have *acted*, hath been in conſequence of what they had *read*, then is the merit of Mr. *Locke*'s principles brought to an iſſue, which is very ſhort, and level to every capacity: "By their fruits ye ſhall "know them."

If the reader wiſhes to ſee natural right, natural liberty, and natural equality, farther expoſed, we refer him to an excellent diſquiſition of *Soame Jenyns*, Eſq; one of the beſt pieces which the preſent times have produced.]

AN

AN INSTANCE OF

MORAL DEMONSTRATION,

OR, A

CONJUGATION OF PROBABILITIES,

PROVING THAT THE RELIGION OF JESUS CHRIST IS FROM GOD,

FROM BISHOP TAYLOR'S DUCTOR DUBITANTIUM,

MORAL DEMONSTRATION

AN INSTANCE OF

MORAL DEMONSTRATION,

OR A

CONJUGATION OF PROBABILITIES,

PROVING THAT THE RELIGION OF JESUS CHRIST IS FROM GOD.

SECT. 12.

THIS diſcourſe, of all the diſputables in the world, ſhall require the feweſt things to be granted; even nothing but what was evident, even nothing but the very ſubject of the queſtion, *viz.* that there was ſuch a man as Jeſus Chriſt; that he pretended ſuch things and taught ſuch doctrines: for he that will prove theſe things to be from God, muſt be allowed that they were from ſomething or other. But this poſtulate I do not aſk for need, but for order's ſake and art; for what the hiſtories of that age reported as a public affair, as one of the moſt eminent tranſactions of the world, that which made ſo much noiſe, which cauſed ſo many changes, which occaſioned ſo many wars, which divided ſo many hearts, which altered ſo many families, which procured ſo many deaths, which obtained ſo many laws in favour, and ſuffered ſo many reſcripts in the diſfavour of its ſelf; that which was not done in a corner, but was thirty-three years and more in acting; which cauſed ſo many ſects, and was oppoſed by ſo much art, and ſo much power that it might not grow, which filled the world with noiſe, which effected

ſuch great changes in the bodies of men, by curing the diſeaſed, and ſmiting the contumacious or the hypocrites; which drew ſo many eyes, and filled ſo many tongues, and employed ſo many pens, and was the care and the queſtion of the whole world at that time, and immediately after; that which was conſigned by public acts and records of courts, which was in the books of friends and enemies, which came accompanied and remarked with eclipſes and ſtars and prodigies of heaven and earth; that which the Jews even in ſpite and againſt their wills confeſſed, and which the witty adverſaries intending to overthrow, could never ſo much as challenge of want of truth in the matter of fact and ſtory; that which they who are infinitely concerned that it ſhould not be believed, or more, that it had never been, do yet only labour to make to appear not to have been divine: certainly, this thing is ſo certain that it was, that the defenders of it need not account it a kindneſs to have it preſuppoſed; for never was any ſtory in the world that had ſo many degrees of credibility, as the ſtory of the perſon, life and death of Jeſus Chriſt: and if he had not been a true prophet, yet that he was in the world, and ſaid and did ſuch things cannot be denied; for even concerning Mahomet, we make no queſtion but he was in the world, and led a great part of mankind after him, and what was leſs proved we infinitely believe; and what all men ſay, and no man denies, and was notorious in itſelf, of this we may make further inquiries whether it was all that which it pretended, for that it did make pretences and was in the world, needs no more probation.

13. But now whether Jeſus Chriſt was ſent from God, and delivered the will of God, we are to take accounts from all the things of the world which were on him, or about him, or from him. Conſider firſt his perſon; he was foretold by all the prophets: he, I ſay, for that appears by the event, and the correſpondencies of their ſayings to his perſon: he was deſcribed by infallible characteriſms which did fit him, and did never fit any but him; for when he was born, then was the fulneſs of time, and the Meſſias was

expected

expected at the time when Jeſus did appear, which gave occaſion to many of the godly then to wait for him, and to hope to live till the time of his revelation: and they did ſo, and with a ſpirit of prophecy which their own nation did confeſs and honour, glorified God at the revelation: and the moſt excellent and devout perſons that were conſpicuous for their piety did then rejoice in him, and confeſs him; and the expectation of him at that time was ſo public and famous, that it gave occaſion to divers impoſtors to abuſe the credulity of the people in pretending to be the Meſſias; but not only the predictions of the time, and the perfect ſynchroniſms did point him out, but at his birth a ſtrange ſtar appeared, which guided certain Levantine princes and ſages to the inquiry after him; a ſtrange ſtar which had an irregular place and an irregular motion, that came by deſign, and acted by counſel, the counſel of the Almighty Guide; it moved from place to place, till it ſtood juſt over the houſe where the babe did ſleep; a ſtar of which the Heathen knew much, who knew nothing of him; a ſtar which Chalcidius affirmed to have ſignified the deſcent of God for the ſalvation of man; a ſtar that guided the wiſe Chaldees to worſhip him with gifts (as the ſame diſciple of Plato does affirm, and) as the holy Scriptures deliver; and this ſtar could be no ſecret; it troubled all the country; it put Herod upon ſtrange arts of ſecurity for his kingdom, it effected a ſad tragedy accidentally, for it occaſioned the death of all the little babes in the city and voiſinage of Bethlehem: but the birth of this young child, which was thus glorified by a ſtar, was alſo ſignified by an angel, and was effected by the holy Spirit of God, in a manner which was in itſelf ſupernatural; a virgin was his mother, and God was his father, and his beginning was miraculous; and this matter of his birth of a virgin was proved to an intereſted and jealous perſon, even to Joſeph the ſuppoſed father of Jeſus; it was affirmed publicly by all his family, and by all his diſciples, and publiſhed in the midſt of all his enemies, who by no artifice could reprove it; a matter ſo famous, that when it was urged as an argument to prove Jeſus to be the Meſſias, by the force

of a prophecy in Iſaiah, " a virgin ſhall conceive a ſon," they who obſtinately refuſed to admit him, did not deny the matter of fact, but denied that it was ſo meant by the prophet, which if it were true, can only prove that Jeſus was more excellent than was foretold by the prophets, but that there was nothing leſs in him than was to be in the Meſſias; it was a matter ſo famous, that the Arabian phyſicians, who can affirm no ſuch things of their Mahomet, and yet not being able to deny it to be true of the holy Jeſus, endeavour to elevate and leſſen the thing, by ſaying, It is not wholly beyond the force of nature, that a virgin ſhould conceive, ſo that it was on all hands undeniable, that the mother of Jeſus was a virgin, a mother without a man. This is that Jeſus at whoſe preſence before he was born, a babe in his mother's belly alſo did leap for joy, who was alſo a perſon extraordinary himſelf, conceived in his mother's old age, after a long barrenneſs, ſignified by an angel in the temple, to his father officiating in his prieſtly office, who was alſo ſtruck dumb for his not preſent believing: all the people ſaw it, and all his kindred were witneſſes of his reſtitution, and he was named by the angel, and his office declared him to be the fore-runner of the holy Jeſus; and this alſo was foretold by one of the old prophets; for the whole ſtory of this divine perſon is a chain of providence and wonder, every link of which is a verification of a prophecy, and all of it is that thing which from Adam to the birth of Jeſus was pointed at and hinted by all the prophets, whoſe words in him paſſed perfectly into the event. This is that Jeſus who, as he was born without a father, ſo he was learned without a maſter; he was a man without age, a doctor in a child's garment, diſputing in the ſanctuary at twelve years old. He was a ſojourner in Egypt, becauſe the poor babe, born of an indigent mother, was a formidable rival to a potent king; and this fear could not come from the deſign of the infant, but muſt needs ariſe from the illuſtrioufneſs of the birth, and the prophecies of the child, and the ſayings of the learned, and the journey of the wiſe men, and the decrees of God: this journey and the return were both managed

by

by the conduct of an angel and a divine dream, for to the Son of God all the angels did rejoice to minister. This blessed person made thus excellent by his Father, and glorious by miraculous consignations, and illustrious by the ministry of heavenly spirits, and proclaimed to Mary and to Joseph by two angels, to the shepherds by a multitude of the heavenly host, to the wise men by a prophecy and by a star, to the Jews by the shepherds, to the Gentiles by the three wise men, to Herod by the doctors of the law, and to himself perfectly known by the inchasing his human nature in the bosom and heart of God, and by the fulness of the Spirit of God, was yet pleased for thirty years together to live an humble, a laborious, a chaste and a devout, a regular and an even, a wise and exemplar, a pious and an obscure life, without complaint, without sin, without design of fame, or grandeur of spirit, till the time came that the clefts of the rock were to open, and the diamond give its lustre, and be worn in the diadems of kings, and then this person was wholly admirable; for he was ushered into the world by the voice of a loud crier in the wilderness, a person austere and wise, of a strange life, full of holiness and full of hardness, and a great preacher of righteousness, a man believed by all the people that he came from God, one who in his own nation gathered disciples publicly, and (which amongst them was a great matter) he was the doctor of a new institution, and baptized all the country, yet this man so great, so revered, so followed, so listenened to by king and people, by doctors and by ideots, by Pharisees and Sadducees, this man preached Jesus to the people, pointed out the Lamb of God, told that he must increase, and himself from all that fame must retire to give him place; he received him to baptism, after having with duty and modesty declared his own unworthiness to give, but rather a worthiness to receive baptism from the holy hands of Jesus; but at the solemnity God sent down the holy Spirit upon his holy Son, and by a voice from heaven, a voice of thunder (and God was in that voice) declared that this was his Son, and that he was delighted in him. This voice from heaven was such, so evi-

dent, ſo certain a conviction of what it did intend to prove, ſo known and accepted as the way of divine revelation under the ſecond temple, that at that time every man that deſired a ſign honeſtly, would have been ſatisfied with ſuch a voice; it being the teſtimony by which God made all extraordinaries to be credible to his people from the days of Ezra, to the death of the nation; and that there was ſuch a voice not only then, but divers times after, was as certain, and made as evident as things of that nature can ordinarily be made. For it being a matter of fact, cannot be ſuppoſed infinite, but limited to time and place, heard by a certain number of perſons, and was as a clap of thunder upon ordinary accounts, which could be heard but by thoſe who were within the ſphere of its own activity; and reported by thoſe to others, who are to give teſtimony as teſtimonies are required, which are credible under the teſt of two or three diſintereſted, honeſt, and true men; and though this was done in the preſence of more, and oftener than once, yet it was a divine teſtimony but at firſt, but is to be conveyed by the means of men; and as God thundered from heaven at the giving of the Law, though that he did ſo, we have notice only from the Books of Moſes received from the Jewiſh nation; ſo he did in the days of the Baptiſt, and ſo he did to Peter, James, and John, and ſo he did in the preſence of the Phariſees and many of the common people; and as it is not to be ſuppoſed that all theſe would join their divided intereſts, for and againſt themſelves for the verification of a lye, ſo if they would have done it, they could not have done it without reproof of their own parties, who would have been glad by the diſcovery only to diſgrace the whole ſtory; but if the report of honeſt and juſt men ſo reputed, may be queſtioned for matter of fact, or may not be accounted ſufficient to make faith when there is no pretence of men to the contrary, beſides that we can have no ſtory tranſmitted to us, no records kept, no acts of courts, no narratives of the days of old, no traditions of our fathers; ſo there could not be left in nature any uſual inſtrument whereby God could, after the manner of men,

declare his own will to us, but either we ſhould never know the will of heaven upon earth, or it muſt be that God muſt not only tell it once but always, and not only always to ſome men, but always to all men; and then as there would be no uſe of hiſtory, or the honeſty of men, and their faithfulneſs in telling any act of God in declaration of his will, ſo there would be perpetual neceſſity of miracles, and we could not ſerve God directly with our underſtanding, for there would be no ſuch thing as faith, that is, of aſſent without conviction of underſtanding; and we could not pleaſe God with believing, becauſe there would be in it nothing of the will, nothing of love and choice; and that faith which is, would be like that of Thomas, to believe what we ſee or hear, and God ſhould not at all govern upon earth unleſs he did continually come himſelf: for thus, all government, all teachers, all apoſtles, all meſſengers would be needleſs, becauſe they could not ſhew to the eye what they told to the ears of men: and it might as well be diſbelieved in all courts and by all princes, that this was not the letter of a prince, or the act of a man, or the writing of his hand, and ſo all human intercourſe muſt ceaſe, and all ſenſes but the eye be uſeleſs as to this affair, or elſe to the ear all voices muſt be ſtrangers but the principal, if, I ſay, no reports ſhall make faith: but it is certain, that when theſe voices were ſent from heaven and heard upon earth, they prevailed amongſt many that heard them not, and diſciples were multiplied upon ſuch accounts, or elſe it muſt be that none that did hear them could be believed by any of their friends and neighbours; for if they were, the voice was as effective at the reflex and rebound as in the direct emiſſion, and could prevail with them that believed their brother or their friend, as certainly as with them that believed their own ears and eyes.

14. I need not ſpeak of the vaſt numbers of miracles which he wrought; miracles which were not more demonſtrations of his power than of his mercy; for they had nothing of pompouſneſs and oſtentation, but infinitely of charity and mercy, and that permanent and laſting and often:

he

he opened the eyes of the blind, he made the crooked ſtraight, he made the weak ſtrong, he cured fevers with the touch of his hand, and an iſſue of blood with the hem of his garment, and ſore eyes with the ſpittle of his mouth and the clay of the earth; he multiplied the loaves and fiſhes, he raiſed the dead to life, a young maiden, the widow's ſon of Naim, and Lazarus, and caſt out devils by the word of his mouth, which he could never do but by the power of God. For Satan does not caſt out Satan, nor a houſe fight againſt itſelf, if it means to ſtand long; and the devil could not help Jeſus, becauſe the holy Jeſus taught men virtue, called them from the worſhipping devils, taught them to reſiſt the devil, to lay aſide all thoſe abominable idolatries by which the devil doth rule in the hearts of men: he taught men to love God, to fly from temptations to ſin, to hate and avoid all thoſe things of which the devil is guilty, for Chriſtianity forbids pride, envy, malice, lying, and yet affirms that the devil is proud, envious, malicious, and the father of lies; and therefore wherever Chriſtianity prevails, the devil is not worſhipped; and therefore he that can think that a man without the power of God could overturn the devil's principles, croſs his deſigns, weaken his ſtrengths, baffle him in his policies, befool him and turn him out of poſſeſſion, and make him open his own mouth againſt himſelf, as he did often, and confeſs himſelf conquered by Jeſus and tormented, as the oracle did to Auguſtus Cæſar, and the devil to Jeſus himſelf, he, I ſay, that thinks a mere man can do this, knows not the weakneſſes of a man, nor the power of an angel: but he that thinks this could be done by compact, and by conſent of the devil, muſt think him to be an intelligence without underſtanding, a power without force, a fool and a ſot to aſſiſt a power againſt himſelf, and to perſecute the power he did aſſiſt, to ſtir up the world to deſtroy the Chriſtians, whoſe Maſter and Lord he did aſſiſt to deſtroy himſelf; and when we read that Porphyrius an Heathen, a profeſſed enemy to Chriſtianity, did ſay, Ἰησοῦ τιμωμένου τὰς θεῶν δημοσίας ὠφελείας οὐκ ἤσθετο *, that ſince Jeſus was wor-

* Euſeb. lib. 5. c. 1. præp. Evang.

ſhipped,

ſhipped, the gods could help no man, that is, the gods which they worſhipped; the poor baffled enervated dæmons. He muſt either think that the devils are as fooliſh as they are weak, or elſe that they did nothing towards this declination of their power; and therefore that they ſuffer it by a power higher than themſelves, that is, by the power of God in the hand of Jeſus.

15. But beſides that God gave teſtimony from heaven concerning him; he alſo gave this teſtimony of himſelf to have come from God, becauſe that he did God's will; for he that is a good man, and lives by the laws of God and of his nation, a life innocent and ſimple, prudent and wiſe, holy and ſpotleſs, unreproved and unſuſpected, he is certainly by all wiſe men ſaid in a good ſenſe to be the Son of God; but he who does well and ſpeaks well, and calls all men to glorify and ſerve God, and ſerves no ends but of holineſs and charity, of wiſdom of hearts and reformation of manners, this man carries great authority in his ſayings, and ought to prevail with good men in good things, for good ends, which is all that is here required. But his nature was ſo ſweet, his manners ſo humble, his words ſo wiſe and compoſed, his comportment ſo grave and winning, his anſwers ſo ſeaſonable, his queſtions ſo deep, his reproof ſo ſevere and charitable, his pity ſo great and merciful, his preachings ſo full of reaſon and holineſs, of weight and authority, his converſation ſo uſeful and beneficent, his poverty great but his alms frequent, his family ſo holy and religious, his and their employment ſo profitable, his meekneſs ſo incomparable, his paſſions without difference, ſave only where zeal or pity carried him on to worthy and apt expreſſions; a perſon that never laughed, but often wept, in a ſenſe of the calamities of others; he loved every man, and hated no man; he gave counſel to the doubtful, and inſtructed the ignorant; he bound up the broken hearts, and ſtrengthened the feeble knees; he relieved the poor, and converted the ſinners; he deſpiſed none that came to him for relief, and as for thoſe that did not he went to them; he took all occaſions of mercy that were offered him, and went

abroad

abroad for more; he ſpent his days in preaching and healing, and his nights in prayers and converſation with God; he was obedient to laws and ſubject to princes, though he was the Prince of Judæa in right of his mother, and of all the world in right of his Father: the people followed him, but he made no conventions, and when they were made, he ſuffered no tumults; when they would have made him a king he withdrew himſelf; when he knew they would put him to death he offered himſelf: he knew men's hearts, and converſed ſecretly, and gave anſwer to their thoughts and prevented their queſtions; he would work a miracle rather than give offence, and yet ſuffer every offence rather than ſee God his Father diſhonoured; he exactly kept the law of Moſes, to which he came to put a period, and yet choſe to ſignify his purpoſe only by doing acts of mercy upon their Sabbath, doing nothing which they ſhould call a breach of a commandment, but healing ſick people, a charity which themſelves would do to beaſts, and yet they were angry at him for doing it to their brethren. In all his life, and in all his converſation with his nation, he was innocent as an angel of light, and when by the greatneſs of his worth, and the ſeverity of his doctrine, and the charity of his miracles, and the noiſes of the people, and his immenſe fame in all that part of the world, and the multitude of his diſciples, and the authority of his ſermons, and his free reproof of their hypocriſy, and his diſcovery of their falſe doctrines and weak traditions, he had branded the reputation of the vicious rulers of the people, and they reſolved to put him to death, they who had the biggeſt malice in the world, and the weakeſt accuſations, were forced to ſupply their want of articles againſt him by making truth to be his fault, and his office to be his crime, and his open confeſſion of what was aſked him to be his article of condemnation; and yet after all this they could not perſuade the competent judge to condemn him, or to find him guilty of any fault, and therefore they were forced to threaten him with Cæſar's name, againſt whom then they would pretend him to be an enemy, though in their charge they neither proved, nor indeed laid it againſt him;

him; and yet to whatſoever they objected he made no return, but his ſilence and his innocence were remarkable and evident, without labour and reply, and needed no more argument than the ſun needs an advocate to prove that he is the brighteſt ſtar in the firmament.

16. Well, ſo it was, they crucified him, and when they did they did as much put out the eye of heaven as deſtroy the Son of God; for when with an incomparable ſweetneſs, and a patience exemplar to all ages of ſufferers, he endured affronts, examinations, ſcorns, inſolencies of rude ungentle tradeſmen, cruel whippings, injurious, unjuſt and unreaſonable uſages from thoſe whom he obliged by all the arts of endearment and offers of the biggeſt kindneſs; at laſt he went to death as to the work which God appointed him, that he might become the world's ſacrifice, and the great example of holineſs, and the inſtance of repreſenting by what way the world was to be made happy [even by ſufferings and ſo entering into heaven] that he might (I ſay) become the Saviour of his enemies, and the elder Brother to his friends, and the Lord of Glory, and the fountain of its emanation. Then it was that God gave new teſtimonies from heaven; the ſun was eclipſed all the while he was upon the croſs, and yet the moon was in the full; that is, he loſt his light, not becauſe any thing in nature did inveſt him, but becauſe the God of nature (as a Heathen at that very time confeſſed, who yet ſaw nothing of this ſad iniquity) did ſuffer. The rocks did rend, the veil of the temple divided of itſelf and opened the incloſures, and diſparked the ſanctuary, and made it pervious to the Gentiles eye; the dead aroſe, and appeared in Jeruſalem to their friends; the centurion and divers of the people ſmote their hearts, and were by theſe ſtrange indications convinced that he was the Son of God. His garments were parted, and lots caſt upon his inward coat; they gave him vinegar and gall to drink, they brake not a bone of him, but they pierced his ſide with a ſpear, looking on him whom they had pierced; according to the prophecies of him, which were ſo clear and deſcended to minutes and circumſtances of his paſſion, that

that there was nothing left by which they could doubt whether this were he or no who was to come into the world: but after all this, that all might be finally verified, and no ſcruple left, after three days burial, a great ſtone being rolled to the face of the grave; and the ſtone ſealed, and a guard of ſoldiers placed about it, he aroſe from the grave, and for forty days together converſed with his followers and diſciples, and beyond all ſuſpicion was ſeen of five hundred brethren at once, which is a number too great to give their conſent and teſtimony to a lye; and it being ſo publicly and confidently affirmed at the very time it was done, and for ever after urged by all Chriſtians, uſed as the moſt mighty demonſtration, proclaimed, preached, talked of, even upbraided to the gainſayers, affirmed by eye-witneſſes, perſuaded to the kindred and friends, and the relatives and companions of all thoſe five hundred perſons who were eye-witneſſes, it is infinitely removed from a reaſonable ſuſpicion; and at the end of thoſe days was taken up into heaven in the ſight of many of them, as Elias was in the preſence of Eliſha.

17. Now he of whom all theſe things are true, muſt needs be more than a mere man; and that they were true was affirmed by very many eye-witneſſes, men who were innocent, plain men, men that had no bad ends to ſerve, men that looked for no preferment by the thing in this life; men to whom their Maſter told they were to expect not crowns and ſcepters, not praiſe of men, or wealthy poſſeſſions, not power and eaſe, but a voluntary caſting away care and attendance upon ſecular affairs, that they might attend their miniſtry; poverty and priſons, trouble and vexation, perſecution and labour, whippings and baniſhment, bonds and death, and for a reward they muſt ſtay till a good day came, but that was not to be at all in this world; and when the day of reſtitution and recompence ſhould come, they ſhould never know till it came, but upon the hope of this and the faith of Jeſus, and the word of God ſo taught, ſo conſigned, they muſt reſt wholly, and for ever. Now let it be conſidered, how could matters of fact be proved better?

and

and how could this be any thing, but ſuch as to rely upon matters of fact? What greater certainty can we have of any thing that was ever done which we ſaw not, or heard not, but by the report of wiſe and honeſt perſons? eſpecially ſince they were ſuch whoſe life and breeding was ſo far from ambition and pompouſneſs, that as they could not naturally and reaſonably hope for any great number of proſelytes, ſo the fame that could be hoped for amongſt them, as it muſt be a matter of their own procuring, and conſequently uncertain, ſo it muſt needs be very inconſiderable, not fit to outweigh the danger and the loſs, nor yet at all valuable by them whoſe education and pretences were againſt it? Theſe we have plentifully: but if theſe men are numerous and united, it is more. Then we have more; for ſo many did affirm theſe things which they ſaw and heard, that thouſands of people were convinced of the truth of them: but then if theſe men offer their oath, it is yet more; but yet not ſo much as we have, for they ſealed thoſe things with their blood; they gave their life for a teſtimony; and what reward can any man expect, if he gives his life for a lye? who ſhall make him recompence, or what can tempt him to do it knowingly? But after all, it is to be remembered, that as God hates lying, ſo he hates incredulity; as we muſt not believe a lye, ſo neither ſtop up our eyes and ears againſt truth; and what we do every minute of our lives in matters of little and of great concernment, if we refuſe to do in our religion, which yet is to be conducted as other human affairs are, by human inſtruments and arguments of perſuaſion proper to the nature of the thing, it is an obſtinacy that is as contrary to human reaſon as it is to divine faith.

18. Theſe things relate to the perſon of the holy Jeſus, and prove ſufficiently that it was extraordinary, that it was divine, that God was with him, that his power wrought in him; and therefore that it was his will which Jeſus taught, and God ſigned. But then if nothing of all this had been, yet even the doctrine itſelf proves itſelf divine, and to come from God.

19. For

19. For it is a doctrine perfective of human nature, that teaches us to love God, and to love one another, to hurt no man, and to do good to every man; it propines to us the nobleſt, the higheſt, and the braveſt pleaſures of the world; the joys of charity, the reſt of innocence, the peace of quiet ſpirits, the wealth of beneficence, and forbids us only to be beaſts and to be devils; it allows all that God and nature intended, and only reſtrains the excreſcences of nature, and forbids us to take pleaſure in that which is the only entertainment of devils, in murders and revenges, malice, and ſpiteful words and actions; it permits corporal pleaſures where they can beſt miniſter to health and ſocieties, to converſation of families, and honour of communities; it teaches men to keep their words, that themſelves may be ſecured in all their juſt intereſts, and to do good to others, that good may be done to them; it forbids biting one another, that we may not be devoured by one another; and commands obedience to ſuperiors, that we may not be ruined in confuſions; it combines governments, and confirms all good laws, and makes peace, and oppoſes and prevents wars where they are not juſt, and where they are not neceſſary. It is a religion that is life and ſpirit, not conſiſting in ceremonies and external amuſements, but in the ſervices of the heart, and the real fruit of lips and hands, that is, of good words and good deeds; it bids us to do that to God which is agreeable to his excellencies, that is, worſhip him with the beſt thing we have, and make all things elſe miniſter to it; it bids us to do that to our neighbour, by which he may be better: it is the perfection of the natural law, and agreeable to our natural neceſſities, and promotes our natural ends and deſigns: it does not deſtroy reaſon, but inſtructs it in very many things, and complies with it in all; it hath in it both heat and light, and is not more effectual than it is beauteous; it promiſes every thing that we can deſire, and yet promiſes nothing but what it does effect; it proclaims war againſt all vices, and generally does command every virtue; it teaches us with eaſe to mortify thoſe affections which reaſon durſt ſcarce reprove, becauſe ſhe hath not ſtrength enough

enough to conquer, and it does create in us thoſe virtues which reaſon of herſelf never knew, and after they are known, could never approve ſufficiently: it is a doctrine in which nothing is ſuperfluous or burdenſome, nor yet is there any thing wanting which can procure happineſs to mankind, or by which God can be glorified: and if wiſdom, and mercy, and juſtice, and ſimplicity, and holineſs, and purity, and meekneſs, and contentedneſs, and charity, be images of God, and rays of divinity, then that doctrine in which all theſe ſhine ſo gloriouſly, and in which nothing elſe is ingredient, muſt needs be from God; and that all this is true in the doctrine of Jeſus, needs no other probation but the reading the words.

20. For that the words of Jeſus are contained in the Goſpels, that is, in the writings of them who were eye-witneſſes and ear-witneſſes of the actions and ſermons of Jeſus, is not at all to be doubted; for in every ſect we believe their own records of doctrine and inſtitution; for it is madneſs to ſuppoſe the Chriſtians to pretend to be ſervants of the laws of Jeſus, and yet to make a law of their own which he made not: no man doubts but that the alcoran is the law of Mahomet, that the Old Teſtament contains the religion of the Jews; and the authority of theſe books is proved by all the arguments of the religion; for all the arguments perſuading to the religion are intended to prove no other than is contained in thoſe books; and theſe having been for fifteen hundred years and more, received abſolutely by all Chriſtian aſſemblies, if any man ſhall offer to make a queſtion of their authority, he muſt declare his reaſons, for the diſciples of the religion have ſufficient preſumption, ſecurity and poſſeſſion, till they can be reaſonably diſturbed; but that now they can never be is infinitely certain, becauſe we have a long, immemorial, univerſal tradition that theſe books were written in thoſe times, by thoſe men whoſe names they bear; they were accepted by all churches at the very firſt notice, except ſome few of the latter, which were firſt received by ſome churches, and then conſented to by all; they were acknowledged by the ſame, and by the next

age for genuine, their authority publiſhed, their words cited, appeals made to them in all queſtions of religion, becauſe it was known and confeſſed that they wrote nothing but that they knew, ſo that they were not deceived; and to ſay they would lie muſt be made to appear by ſomething extrinſical to this inquiry, and was never ſo much as plauſibly pretended by any adverſaries; and it being a matter of another man's will, muſt be declared by actions, or not at all. But beſides the men that wrote them were to be believed becauſe they did miracles, they wrote prophecies, which are verified by the event; perſons were cured at their ſepulchres; a thing ſo famous, that it was confeſſed even by the enemies of the religion: and after all, that which the world ought to rely upon, is the wiſdom, and the providence, and the goodneſs of God; all which it concerned to take care that the religion, which himſelf ſo adorned and proved by miracles and mighty ſigns, ſhould not be loſt, nor any falſe writings be obtruded inſtead of true, leſt without our fault the will of God become impoſſible to be obeyed. But to return to the thing: all thoſe excellent things which ſingly did make famous ſo many ſects of philoſophers, and remarked ſo many princes of their ſects, all them united, and many more which their eyes ὄμματα νυκτερίδων, dark and dim, could not ſee, are heaped together in this ſyſtem of wiſdom and holineſs. Here are plain precepts full of deepeſt myſtery; here are the meaſures of holineſs and approaches to God deſcribed; obedience and conformity, mortification of the body, and elevations of the ſpirit, abſtractions from earth, and arts of ſociety and union with heaven, degrees of excellencies, and tendencies to perfection, imitations of God, and converſations with him; theſe are the heights and deſcents, upon the plain grounds of natural reaſon, and natural religion; for there is nothing commanded but what our reaſon by nature ought to chooſe, and yet nothing of natural reaſon taught but what is heightened and made more perfect by the ſpirit of God; and when there is any thing in the religion that is againſt fleſh and blood, it is only when fleſh and blood is againſt us, and againſt reaſon, when fleſh and

blood

blood either would hinder us from great felicity, or bring us into great misery: to conclude, it is such a law, that nothing can hinder men to receive and entertain, but a pertinacious baseness and love to vice, and none can receive it but those who resolve to be good and excellent; and if the holy Jesus had come into the world with less splendor of power, and mighty demonstrations, yet even the excellency of what he taught, makes him alone fit to be the master of the world.

21. But then let us consider what this excellent person did effect, and with what instruments he brought so great things to pass. He was to put a period to the rites of Moses, and the religion of the temple, of which the Jews were zealous even unto pertinacy; to reform the manners of all mankind; to confound the wisdom of the Greeks, to break in pieces the power of the devil, to destroy the worship of all false gods, to pull down their oracles, and change their laws, and by principles wise and holy to reform the false discourses of the world. But see what was to be taught; a Trinity in the Unity of the Godhead; τρία ἓν καὶ ἓν τρία; that is the Christian arithmetic, Three are one, and one are three: so Lucian in his Philopatris, or some other, derides the Christian doctrine; see their philosophy, *ex nihilo nihil fit*. No: *ex nihilo omnia*, all things are made of nothing; and a Man-God and a God-man, the same person finite and infinite, born in time, and yet from all eternity the Son of God, but yet born of a woman, and she a maid, but yet a mother; resurrection of the dead, re-union of soul and body; this was part of the Christian physics, or their natural philosophy. But then certainly their moral was easy and delicious. It is so indeed, but not to flesh and blood, whose appetites it pretends to regulate, or to destroy, to restrain, or else to mortify: fasting and penance, and humility, loving our enemies, restitution of injuries, and self-denial, and taking up the cross, and losing all our goods, and giving our life for Jesus: as the other was hard to believe, so this is as hard to do. But for whom, and under whose conduct was all this to be believed, and all this to be

done, and all this to be ſuffered? Surely for ſome glorious and mighty prince, whoſe ſplendor as far outſhines the Roman empire as the jewels of Cleopatra outſhined the ſwaddling clothes of the Babe at Bethlehem. No, it was not ſo neither: for all this was for Jeſus, whom his followers preached; a poor Babe born in a ſtable, the ſon of a carpenter, cradled in a cratch, ſwaddled in poor clouts; it was for him whom they indeed called a god, but yet whom all the world knew, and they themſelves ſaid, was whipped at a poſt, nailed to a croſs; he fell under the malice of the Jews his countrymen, and the power of his Roman lords, a cheap and a pitiful ſacrifice, without beauty, and without ſplendor. The deſign is great, but does not yet ſeem poſſible: but therefore let us ſee what inſtruments the holy Jeſus choſe to effect theſe ſo mighty changes, to perſuade ſo many propoſitions, to endear ſo great ſufferings, to overcome ſo great enemies, to maſter ſo many impoſſibilities which *this* doctrine and *this* law from *this* Maſter were ſure to meet withal.

22. Here, here it is that the divinity of the power is proclaimed. When a man goes to war, he raiſes as great an army as he can to out-number his enemy; but when God fights, three hundred men that lap like a dog are ſufficient; nay, one word can diſſolve the greateſt army. He that means to effect any thing, muſt have means of his own proportionable; and if they be not, he muſt fail, or derive them from the mighty. See then with what inſtruments the holy Jeſus ſets upon this great reformation of the world. Twelve men of obſcure and poor birth, of contemptible trades and quality, without learning, without breeding; theſe men were ſent into the midſt of a knowing and wiſe world to diſpute with the moſt famous philoſophers of Greece, to out-wit all the learning of Athens, to out-preach all the Roman orators, to introduce into a newly ſettled empire, which would be impatient of novelties and change, ſuch a change as muſt deſtroy all their temples, or remove thence all their gods: againſt which change all the zeal of the world, and all the paſſions, and all the ſeeming pretences which

which they could make, muſt needs be violently oppoſed: a change that introduced new laws, and cauſed them to reverſe the old, to change that religion under which their fathers long did proſper, and under which the Roman empire obtained ſo great a grandeur, for a religion which in appearance was ſilly and humble, meek and peaceable, not apt indeed to do harm, but expoſing men to all the harm in the world, abating their courage, blunting their ſwords, teaching peace and unactiveneſs, and making the ſoldiers arms in a manner uſeleſs, and untying their military girdle; a religion which contradicted their reaſons of ſtate, and erected new judicatories, and made the Roman courts to be ſilent, and without cauſes; a religion that gave countenance to the poor and pitiful, (but in a time when riches were adored, and ambition eſteemed the greateſt nobleneſs, and pleaſure thought to be the chiefeſt good) it brought no peculiar bleſſing to the rich or mighty, unleſs they would become poor and humble in ſome real ſenſe or other; a religion that would change the face of things, and would alſo pierce into the ſecrets of the ſoul, and unravel all the intrigues of hearts, and reform all evil manners, and break vile habits into gentleneſs and counſel: that ſuch a religion, in ſuch a time, preached by ſuch mean perſons, ſhould triumph over the philoſophy of the world, and the arguments of the ſubtle, and the ſermons of the eloquent, and the power of princes, and the intereſt of ſtates, and the inclinations of nature, and the blindneſs of zeal, and the force of cuſtom, and the pleaſures of ſin, and the buſy arts of the devil, that is, againſt wit and power, and money, and religion, and wilfulneſs, and fame, and empire, which are all the things in the world that can make a thing impoſſible; this I ſay could not be by the proper force of ſuch inſtruments; for no man can ſpan heaven with an infant's palm, nor govern wiſe empires with diagrams. It were impudence to ſend a footman to command Cæſar to lay down his arms, to diſband his legions, and throw himſelf into Tyber, or keep a tavern next to Pompey's theatre; but if a ſober man ſhall ſtand alone unarmed, undefended, or unprovided,

and ſhall tell that he will make the ſun ſtand ſtill, or remove a mountain, or reduce Xerxes's army to the ſcantling of a ſingle troop, he that believes he will and can do this, muſt believe he does it by a higher power than he can yet perceive, and ſo it was in the preſent tranſaction. For that the holy Jeſus made inviſible powers to do him viſible honours, that his Apoſtles hunted the dæmons from their tripods, their navels, their dens, their hollow pipes, their temples, and their altars; that he made the oracles ſilent, as Lucian, Porphyry, Celſus, and other Heathens confeſs; that againſt the order of new things, which let them be never ſo profitable or good, do yet ſuffer reproach, and cannot prevail, unleſs they commence in a time of advantage and favour, yet that this ſhould flouriſh like the palm by preſſure, grow glorious by oppoſition, thrive by perſecution, and was demonſtrated by objections, argues a higher cauſe than the immediate inſtrument; now how this higher cauſe did intervene, is viſible and notorious: The Apoſtles were not learned, but the holy Jeſus promiſed that he would ſend down wiſdom from above, from the Father of ſpirits; they had no power, but they ſhould be inveſted with power from on high; they were ignorant and timorous, but he would make them learned and confident, and ſo he did: he promiſed that in a few days he would ſend the Holy Ghoſt upon them, and he did ſo; after ten days they felt and ſaw a glorious immiſſion from heaven, lights of moveable fire ſitting upon their heads, and that light did illuminate their hearts, and the mighty ruſhing wind inſpired them with a power of ſpeaking divers languages, and brought to their remembrances all that Jeſus did and taught, and made them wiſe to conduct ſouls, and bold to venture, and prudent to adviſe, and powerful to do miracles, and witty to convince gainſayers, and hugely inſtructed in the Scriptures, and gave them the ſpirit of government, and the ſpirit of prophecy. This thing was ſo public, that at the firſt notice of it three thouſand ſouls were converted on that very day, at the very time when it was done; for it was certainly a viſible demonſtration of an inviſible power, that ignorant perſons

who

who were never taught, ſhould in an inſtant ſpeak all the languages of the Roman empire; and indeed this thing was ſo neceſſary to be ſo, and ſo certain that it was ſo, ſo public and ſo evident, and ſo reaſonable, and ſo uſeful, that it is not eaſy to ſay whether it was the indication of a greater power, or a greater wiſdom; and now the means was proportionable enough to the biggeſt end; without learning they could not confute the learned world; but therefore God became their teacher; without power they could not break the devil's violence, but therefore God gave them power; without courage they could not conteſt againſt all the violence of the Jews and Gentiles; but therefore God was their ſtrength, and gave them fortitude; without great caution and providence they could not avoid the traps of crafty perſecutors, but therefore God gave them caution, and made them provident; and as Beſaleel and Aholiah received the ſpirit of God, the ſpirit of underſtanding to enable them to work excellently in the tabernacle, ſo had the Apoſtles to make them wiſe for the work of God and the miniſteries of his diviner tabernacle, which God pitched, not man. Immediately upon this, the Apoſtles, to make a fulneſs of demonſtration, and an undeniable conviction, gave the ſpirit to others alſo, to Jews and Gentiles, and to the men of Samaria; and they ſpake with tongues, and propheſied; then they preached to all nations, and endured all perſecutions, and cured all diſeaſes, and raiſed the dead to life, and were brought before tribunals, and confeſſed the name of Jeſus, and convinced the blaſphemous Jews out of their own prophets, and not only prevailed upon women and weak men, but even upon the braveſt and wiſeſt. All the diſciples of John the Baptiſt, the Nazarenes and Ebionites, Nicodemus, and Joſeph of Arimathea, Sergius the preſident, Dionyſius, an Athenian judge, and Polycarpus, Juſtinus and Irenæus, Athenagoras and Origen, Tertullian, and Clemens of Alexandria, who could not be ſuch fools as upon a matter not certainly true, but probably falſe, to unravel their former principles, and to change their liberty for a priſon, wealth for poverty, honour for diſreputation, life for death, if by

ſuch exchange they had not been ſecured of truth and holineſs, and the will of God.

23. But above all theſe was Saul, a bold and a witty, a zealous and a learned young man, who going with letters to perſecute the Chriſtians of Damaſcus, was by a light from heaven called from his furious march, reproved by God's angel for perſecuting the cauſe of Jeſus, was ſent to the city, baptized by a Chriſtian miniſter, inſtructed, and ſent abroad; and he became the prodigy of the world for learning and zeal, for preaching and writing, for labour and ſufferance, for government and wiſdom; he was admitted to ſee the holy Jeſus after the Lord was taken into heaven; he was taken up into paradiſe; he converſed with angels; he ſaw unſpeakable rays of glory, and beſides that himſelf ſaid it, who had no reaſon to lie, who would get nothing by it here but a conjugation of troubles, and who ſhould get nothing by it hereafter, if it were falſe; beſides this I ſay, that he did all thoſe acts of zeal and obedience for the promotion of the religion, does demonſtrate he had reaſon extraordinary for ſo ſudden a change, ſo ſtrange a labour, ſo frequent and incomparable ſufferings: and therefore as he did and ſuffered ſo much upon ſuch glorious motives, ſo he ſpared not to publiſh it to all the world; he ſpake it to kings and princes; he told it to the envious Jews; he had partners of his journey, who were witneſſes of the miraculous accident; and in his publication he urged the notoriouſneſs of the fact, as a thing not feigned, not private, but done at noon day, under the teſt of competent perſons; and it was a thing that proved itſelf, for it was effective of a preſent, a great, and a permanent change.

24. But now it is no new wonder, but a purſuance of the ſame conjugation of great and divine things, that the ſame and religion of Jeſus was with ſo incredible a ſwiftneſs ſcattered over the face of the habitable world, from one end of the earth unto the other; it filled all Aſia immediately; it paſſed preſently to Europe, and to the furtheſt Africans; and all the way it went it told nothing but an holy and an humble ſtory, that he who came to bring it

into

into the world, died an ignominious death, and yet this death did not take away their courage, but added much: for they could not fear death for that Maſter, whom they knew to have for their ſakes ſuffered death, and came to life again. But now infinite numbers of perſons of all ſexes, and all ages, and all countries, came in to the holy crucifix; and he that was crucified in the reign of Tiberius, was in the time of Nero, even in Rome itſelf, and in Nero's family by many perſons eſteemed for a god; and it was upon public record that he was ſo acknowledged; and this was by a Chriſtian, Juſtin Martyr, urged to the ſenate, and to the emperors themſelves, who if it had been otherwiſe could eaſily have confuted the bold allegation of the Chriſtian, who yet did die for that Jeſus who was ſo ſpeedily reputed for a God; the croſs was worn upon breaſts, printed in the air, drawn upon foreheads, carried on banners, put upon crowns imperial; and yet the Chriſtians were ſought for to puniſhments, and exquiſite puniſhments ſought forth for them: their goods were confiſcate, their names odious, priſons were their houſes, and ſo many kinds of tortures invented for them, that Domitius Ulpianus hath ſpent ſeven books in deſcribing the variety of tortures the poor Chriſtian was put to at his firſt appearing; and yet in deſpite of all this, and ten thouſand other objections and impoſſibilities, whatſoever was for them made the religion grow, and whatſoever was againſt them made it grow; if they had peace, the religion was proſperous; if they had perſecution, it was ſtill proſperous: if princes favoured them, the world came in, becauſe the Chriſtians lived holily; if princes were incenſed, the world came in, becauſe the Chriſtians died bravely. They ſought for death with greedineſs, they deſired to be grinded in the teeth of lions, and with joy they beheld the wheels and the bended trees, the racks and the gibbets, the fires and the burning irons, which were like the chair of Elias to them, inſtruments to carry them to heaven, into the boſom of their beloved Jeſus.

25. Who would not acknowledge the divinity of this perſon, and the excellency of this inſtitution, that ſhould ſee

infants

infants to weary the hands of hangmen for the teſtimony of Jeſus? and wiſe men preach this doctrine for no other viſible reward, but ſhame and death, poverty and baniſhment? and hangmen converted by the blood of martyrs ſpringing upon their faces, which their impious hands and cords have ſtrained through their fleſh? who would not have confeſſed the honour of Jeſus, when he ſhould ſee miracles done at the tombs of martyrs, and devils tremble at the mention of the name of Jeſus, and the world running to the honour of the poor Nazarene, and kings and queens kiſſing the feet of the poor ſervants of Jeſus? Could a few fiſhermen and a publican effect all this for the ſon of a poor maiden of Judea? Can we ſuppoſe all the world, or ſo great a part of mankind can conſent by chance, or ſuffer ſuch changes for nothing? or for any thing leſs than this? The ſon of the poor maiden was the Son of God, and the fiſhermen ſpake by a divine ſpirit, and they catched the world with holineſs and miracles, with wiſdom and power bigger than the ſtrength of all the Roman legions. And what can be added to all this, but this thing alone to prove the divinity of Jeſus? He is a God, or at leaſt is taught by God, who can foretel future contingencies; and ſo did the holy Jeſus, and ſo did his diſciples.

26. Our bleſſed Lord, while he was alive, foretold that after his death his religion ſhould flouriſh more than when he was alive: he foretold perſecutions to his diſciples; he foretold the miſſion of the Holy Ghoſt to be in a very few days after his aſcenſion, which within ten days came to paſs; he propheſied that the fact of Mary Magdalen in anointing the head and feet of her Lord, ſhould be public and known as the Goſpel itſelf, and ſpoken of in the ſame place; he foretold the deſtruction of Jeruſalem, and the ſigns of its approach, and that it ſhould be by war, and particularly after the manner of prophets, ſymbolically named the nation ſhould do it, pointing out the Roman eagles; he foretold his death, and the manner of it, and plainly beforehand publiſhed his reſurrection, and told them it ſhould be the ſign to that generation, viz. the great argument to prove

him

him to be the Christ, he prophesied that there should arise false Christs after him, and it came to pass to the extreme great calamity of the nation; and lastly, he foretold that his beloved disciple St. John should tarry upon the earth till his coming again; that is, to his coming to judgment upon Jerusalem; and that his religion should be preached to the Gentiles; that it should be scattered over all the world, and be received by all nations; that it should stay upon the face of the earth till his last coming to judge all the world, and that the gates of hell should not be able to prevail against his church; which prophecy is made good thus long, till this day, and is as a continual argument to justify the divinity of the author: the continuance of the religion helps to continue it, for it proves that it came from God, who foretold that it should continue; and therefore it must continue, because it came from God; and therefore it came from God, because it does and shall for ever continue, according to the word of the holy Jesus.

27. But after our blessed Lord was entered into glory, the disciples also were prophets; Agabus foretold the dearth that was to be in the Roman empire in the days of Claudius Cæsar, and that St. Paul should be bound at Jerusalem; St. Paul foretold the entering in of heretics into Asia after his departure; and he and St. Peter and St. Jude, and generally the rest of the Apostles had two great predictions, which they used not only as a verification of the doctrine of Jesus, but as a means to strengthen the hearts of the disciples who were so broken with persecution: the one was, that there should arise a sect of vile men, who should be enemies to religion and government, and cause a great apostacy, which happened notoriously in the sect of the Gnostics, which those three Apostles and St. John notoriously and plainly do describe: and the other was, that although the Jewish nation did mightily oppose the religion, it should be but for a while, for they should be destroyed in a short time, and their nation made extremely miserable; but for the Christians, if they would fly from Jerusalem, and go to Pella, there should not a hair of their head perish:

the

the verification of this prophecy the Chriſtians extremely longed for, and wondered it ſtaid ſo long, and began to be troubled at the delay, and ſuſpected all was not well, when the great proof of their religion was not verified; and while they were in thoughts of heart concerning it, the ſad *catalyſis* did come, and ſwept away one million one hundred thouſand of the nation; and from that day forward the nation was broken in pieces with intolerable calamities, they are ſcattered over the face of the earth, and are a vagabond nation, but yet, like oil in a veſſel of wine, broken into bubbles, but kept in their own circles; and they ſhall never be an united people till they are ſervants of the holy Jeſus; but ſhall remain without prieſt or temple, without altar or ſacrifice, without city or country, without the land of Promiſe, or the promiſe of a bleſſing, till our Jeſus is their High Prieſt, and the Shepherd to gather them into his fold: and this very thing is a mighty demonſtration againſt the Jews by their own prophets, for when Iſaiah and Jeremiah, and Malachi had propheſied the rejection of the Jews and the calling of the Gentiles, and the change of the old law, and the introduction of a new by the Meſſias, that this was he, was therefore certain, becauſe he taught the world a new law, and preſently after the publication of this, the old was abrogate, and not only went into diſuetude, but into a total abolition among all the world; and for thoſe of the remnant of the ſcattered Jews who obſtinately blaſpheme, the law is become impoſſible to them, and they placed in ſuch circumſtances that they need not diſpute concerning its obligation: for it being external and corporeal, ritual, and at laſt made alſo local, when the circumſtances are impoſſible, the law that was wholly ceremonial and circumſtantial muſt needs paſs away, and when they have loſt their prieſthood, they cannot retain the law, as no man takes care to have his beard ſhaved when his head is off.

28. And it is a wonder to conſider how the anger of God is gone out upon that miſerable people, and that ſo great a blindneſs is fallen upon them, it being evident and notorious that the Old Teſtament was nothing but a ſhadow and um-

brage

brage of the New, that the prophecies of that are plainly verified in this; that all the predictions of the Meſſias are moſt undeniably accompliſhed in the perſon of Jeſus Chriſt, ſo that they cannot with any plauſibleneſs or colour be turned any other way, and be applied to any other perſon; although the Jews make illiterate allegations, and prodigious dreams, by which they have fooled them themſelves for one thouſand ſix hundred years together, and ſtill hope without reaſon, and are confident without revelation, and purſue a ſhadow while they quit the glorious body: while in the mean time the Chriſtian prays for his converſion, and is at reſt in the truth of Jeſus, and hath certain unexpreſſible confidencies and internal lights, clarities of the holy Spirit of God, and loves to the holy Jeſus produced in his ſoul, that he will die when he cannot diſpute, and is ſatisfied and he knows not how, and is ſure by comforts, and comforted by the excellency of his belief, which ſpeaks nothing but holineſs, and light and reaſon, and peace and ſatisfactions infinite, becauſe he is ſure that all the world can be happy if they would live by the religion of Jeſus; and that neither ſocieties of men nor ſingle perſons can have felicity but by this; and that therefore God who ſo decrees to make men happy, hath alſo decreed that it ſhall for ever be upon the face of the earth, till the earth itſelf ſhall be no more. Amen.

29. Now if againſt this vaſt heap of things any man ſhall but confront the pretences of any other religion, and ſee how they fail both of reaſon and holineſs, of wonder and divinity, how they enter by force, and are kept up by human intereſts, how ignorant and unholy, how unlearned and pitiful are their pretences, the darkneſſes of theſe muſt add great eminency to the brightneſs of that. For the Jews' religion which came from heaven is therefore not now to be practiſed, becauſe it did come from heaven, and was to expire into the Chriſtian, it being nothing but the image of this perfection; and the Jews needed no other argument but this, that God hath made theirs impoſſible now to be done; for he that ties to ceremonies and outward uſages,

temples

temples and altars, ſacrifices and prieſts, troubleſome and expenſive rites and figures of future ſignification, means that there ſhould be an abode and fixed dwelling, for theſe are not to be done by an ambulatory people; and therefore ſince God hath ſcattered the people into atoms and crumbs of ſociety, without temple or prieſt, without ſacrifice or altar, without Urim or Thummim, without prophet or viſion, even communicating with them no way but by ordinary providence, it is but too evident, that God hath nothing to do with them in the matter of that religion, but that it is expired, and no way obligatory to them or pleaſing to him which is become impoſſible to be acted; whereas the Chriſtian religion is as eternal as the ſoul of a man, and can no more ceaſe than our ſpirits can die, and can worſhip upon mountains and caves, in fields and churches, in peace and war, in ſolitude and ſociety, in perſecution and in ſunſhine, by night and by day, and be ſolemnized by clergy and laity in the eſſential parts of it, and is the perfection of the ſoul, and the higheſt reaſon of man, and the glorification of God.

30. But for the Heathen religions it is evidently to be ſeen, that they are nothing but an abuſe of the natural inclination which all men have to worſhip a God, whom, becauſe they know not, they gueſs at in the dark; for that they know there is and ought to be ſomething that hath the care and providence of their affairs. But the body of their religion is nothing but little arts of governments, and ſtratagems of princes, and devices to ſecure the government of new uſurpers, or to make obedience to the laws ſure, by being ſacred, and to make the yoke that was not natural, pleaſant by ſomething that is. But yet for the whole body of it who ſees not that their worſhippings could not be ſacred, becauſe they were done by ſomething that is impure; they appeaſed their gods with adulteries and impure mixtures, by ſuch things which Cato was aſhamed to ſee, by gluttonous eatings of fleſh, and impious drinkings, and they did *litare in humano ſanguine*, they ſacrificed men and women and children to their dæmons, as is notorious in the

rites

rites of Bacchus Omeſta amongſt the Greeks, and of Jupiter, to whom a Greek and a Greekeſs, a Galatian and a Galateſs were yearly offered; in the anſwers of the oracles to Calchas, as appears in Homer and Virgil; who ſees not that crimes were warranted by the example of their immortal gods, and that what did diſhonour themſelves, they ſang to the honour of their gods, whom they affirmed to be paſſionate and proud, jealous and revengeful, amorous and luſtful, fearful and impatient, drunken and ſleepy, weary and wounded; that the religions were made laſting by policy and force, by ignorance, and the force of cuſtom, by the preferring an inveterate error, and loving of a quiet and proſperous evil, by the arguments of pleaſure, and the correſpondencies of ſenſuality, by the fraud of oracles, and the patronage of vices, and becauſe they feared every change as an earthquake, as ſuppoſing overturnings of their old error to be the everſion of their well eſtabliſhed governments; and it had been ordinarily impoſſible that ever Chriſtianity ſhould have entered, if the nature and excellency of it had not been ſuch as to enter like rain into a fleece of wool, or the ſun into a window without noiſe or violence, without emotion and diſordering the political conſtitution, without cauſing trouble to any man but what his own ignorance or peeviſhneſs was pleaſed to ſpin out of his own bowels, but did eſtabliſh governments, ſecure obedience, made the laws firm, and the perſons of princes to be ſacred; it did not oppoſe force by force, nor *ſtrike princes for juſtice*; it defended itſelf againſt enemies by patience, and overcame them by kindneſs; it was the great inſtrument of God to demonſtrate his power in our weakneſſes, and to do good to mankind by the imitation of his excellent goodneſs.

31. Laſtly, he that conſiders concerning the religion and perſon of Mahomet, that he was a vicious perſon, luſtful and tyrannical, that he propounded incredible and ridiculous propoſitions to his diſciples, that it entered by the ſword, by blood and violence, by murder and robbery; that it propounds ſenſual rewards, and allures to compliance, by bribing our baſeſt luſts; that it conſerves itſelf by the ſame means

it entered; that it is unlearned and fooliſh, againſt reaſon, and the diſcourſes of all wiſe men; that it did no miracles, and made falſe prophecies: in ſhort, that in the perſon that founded it, in the article it perſuades, in the manner of prevailing, in the reward it offers, it is unholy and fooliſh and rude; it muſt needs appear to be void of all pretence, and that no man of reaſon can ever be fairly perſuaded by arguments, that it is the daughter of God and came down from heaven. Since therefore there is nothing to be ſaid for any other religion, and ſo very much for Chriſtianity, every one of whoſe pretences can be proved as well as the things themſelves do require, and as all the world expects ſuch things ſhould be proved; it follows that the holy Jeſus is the Son of God, that his religion is commanded by God, and is that way by which he will be worſhipped and honoured, and that "there is no other name under heaven by which we "can be ſaved, but only by the name of the Lord Jeſus." He that puts his ſoul upon this cannot periſh; neither can he be reproved who hath ſo much reaſon and argument for his religion. *Sit anima mea cum Chriſtianis*; I pray God my ſoul may be numbered amongſt the Chriſtians.

A SHORT AND EASY

METHOD

WITH THE

JEWS,

WHEREIN THE

CERTAINTY

OF THE

CHRISTIAN RELIGION

IS DEMONSTRATIVELY PROVED,

FROM THE

FOUR RULES

MADE USE OF AGAINST THEM,

SHEWING,

That these Four Rules do [illegible]
more than the Design of
CHRIST.

With an Answer to the [illegible]
and Persecutors against Christianity.

By CHARLES [illegible]

PREFACE.

I. I ENDEAVOURED, when I ſet my thoughts upon this ſubject, to find out the moſt modern objections of the Jews; becauſe my buſineſs is with thoſe of the preſent age. I procured what I could of what they have, of late, publiſhed in their defence in Holland and Germany. What Grotius has wrote concerning them in his *De Veritate Relig. Chriſtian.* is well known, becauſe reprinted at Oxford, and tranſlated into Engliſh; but the arguments of the Jews are rather there ſuppoſed, than told us in their own words. In the year 1644, Hackſpan publiſhed R. Lipmann's book Nizachon, and does reaſon with them upon their principles. Afterwards, in the year 1655, Hornbeck wrote againſt them; but the lateſt I find is Limborch, *Anno* 1687, his *Amica Collat. cum Erudit. Judæo*; wherein the Jews defence, arguments, and objections are ſet down at large, in the Jews own words. Therefore I have made moſt uſe of this book, and have taken thence the preſent principles of the Jews, out of the writings of that learned Jew, which is there inſerted verbatim: and indeed he makes the beſt defence for them that, I think, their cauſe will bear; and ſhews himſelf a man of letters, and of great natural wit and ſagacity. Therefore I conclude, that we have here the *jugulum cauſæ*, the heart of the cauſe; and, if ſufficiently anſwered, the likelieſt method to bring matters to an iſſue.

II. I have here forborn to enter upon the objections of the Jews concerning the genealogies and chrono-

logical niceties which they raiſe againſt ſeveral paſſages of the New Teſtament; becauſe that is done lately by a better hand; and becauſe there are more objections of this ſort, which are brought by the Deiſts againſt the Old Teſtament than the New: and therefore the Jews are equally concerned herein with us, againſt the Deiſts; and cannot make ſo many objections againſt us upon this head, as are made againſt themſelves.

But chiefly, becauſe objections are no anſwers; and, as hereafter ſhewn, there is no truth, even the exiſtence of a God, againſt which objections and difficulties may not be ſtarted: and herein the Deiſts are concerned againſt the Atheiſts (if they be not the ſame) as well as the Jew or Chriſtian. It is eaſier to object than to anſwer; but if the proof be clear for the truth of any thing, we muſt ſubmit to it, though we were not able to ſolve every difficulty; and the chaſing of difficulties diverts the queſtion, and often loſes it; and they are many times brought for that purpoſe: beſides making books ſo long and tedious, that few have the leiſure or attention to go through with them.

Therefore I have choſen, for once, to put the Deiſts upon the defenſive; and if they cannot anſwer, they muſt ſurrender; for it is not a nicety or objection that I inſiſt upon; but the merits of the cauſe, to which every one is obliged to anſwer.

And as to this, I have given them full liberty, and invited them to make all the objections that they can; and I have made the ſtrongeſt for them that I could think of: let them make ſtronger.

I have had greater conſideration for the Jews (becauſe they deſerve it more) and entered more at large

upon

upon their objections and prejudices, which has ſwelled the ſecond part ſo much beyond the firſt.

3. Let me here take notice of the uncertainty of the genealogies now kept of Jewiſh families. They have intermarried with their proſelytes of all nations, and ſometimes with others; inſomuch that they cannot be ſure of one Jew now in the world, who is of the pure and unmixed blood of the Jews. Nay more, whether moſt of them be not ſprung from proſelytes of the Heathens, Mahometans, and apoſtate Chriſtians. Therefore they can never know whether any Meſſiah, who ſhall hereafter ſet up, be of the tribe of Judah, or family of David, according to the prophecies of the Meſſiah; for they have no certainty of either tribe or family now amongſt them.

III. As to the Gentiles, and revealed religion,

1. What is ſaid of the Sybils, I would have ſo underſtood, as that I do not put the ſtreſs whether thoſe books of the Sybils that we have now, have received no additions or interpolations from what they were in the ſecond century, when quoted by the Fathers: but that, as they were then, and before Chriſt came, they had moſt flagrant teſtimonies to our bleſſed Saviour, which confounded the Gentiles; and that they were not, at that time, corrupted; as there is no proof that they have been ſince.

2. Plato, in his Diſcourſe concerning Prayer and the Worſhip of God, hereafter quoted, concludes, that men, by their natural reaſon, cannot find out what ſort of worſhip will be acceptable to God; nor can be ſure what they ought to pray for according to his will: and that it was ſafer to forbear ſacrifices and prayer, than to venture upon it when we did not know but that we might provoke God thereby, inſtead of

pleaſing him. That therefore it was neceſſary they ſhould wait till God ſhould ſend ſome perſon from heaven to inſtruct them in this; and that they did expect ſuch a perſon to be ſent; and they greatly longed to ſee that time, and that man, who they believed ſhould come. They ſaw his day, and rejoiced, as Abraham did (*a*); but not ſo clearly, not having ſo full and expreſs revelation of him as Abraham had. But from revelation they had it, (and not merely from the ſtrength of their reaſon) though, perhaps, they knew it not; for they declared that they had it by tradition from their fathers; and in all probability, it had deſcended through all Adam's poſterity, from the firſt promiſe of it, Gen. iii. 15. together with the inſtitution of ſacrifices; which were ordained, not only as conſtant remembrances of it, but as viſible types of the fulfilling of it; though the original, and full import of the one, as well as the other, had been loſt amongſt the Heathen. This is brought to ſhew the expectation that the Gentiles had of a Meſſiah to come.

But here I would, from this reaſoning of Plato's, infer the neceſſity of revealed religion, againſt the Deiſts. Here they ſee that the wiſeſt of the philoſophers did own, that they were wholly at a loſs and uncertainty without it.

And withal, it ſhews that the wiſeſt of the Heathen did not believe the pretended revelations of their gods. And therefore there can lie no compariſon betwixt theſe and the faith which is moſt ſurely believed by the Chriſtians. Upon what grounds, is ſhewn hereafter; and that they are infallible.

(*a*) John viii. 56.

A SHORT AND EASY

METHOD

WITH THE

JEWS.

BRETHREN, my heart's desire and prayer to God for Israel is, that they might be saved. The first part of this discourse was wrote against the Deists, equal enemies to you and us, who deny all instituted and revealed religion; and I have justified the truth of yours, while I have asserted that of the Christian religion: they both stand upon one bottom. They only, of all the revelations that ever were pretended in the world, can shew the four marks beforementioned; which do infallibly demonstrate the truth of any matter of fact, where they all do meet; and the consequence is as plain, that if the revelation of Moses be true, that of Christ must be true also. And you can never demonstrate the truth of the matters of fact of Moses by any arguments or evidences, which will not as strongly evince the truth of the matters of fact of Christ; and, on the other hand, you cannot overthrow the matters of fact of Christ, but you must, by the same means, destroy those of Moses. So that I hope you are involved under the happy necessity, either to renounce Moses, or to embrace Christ.

But if you will allow (as some of you have done) that the matters of fact of our Lord Jesus, as recorded in the Gospels, are true; but will contend that this does not infer the

truth of his doctrine; becauſe, as may be alleged, thoſe ſeeming miracles which he wrought were done by magic; then, I beſeech you, how will you reſcue the miracles of Moſes from the ſame objection? The compariſon, in this caſe, muſt lie betwixt the miracles of Moſes and of Chriſt; and I believe you will not deny but that thoſe recorded in the Goſpel are full as great as thoſe in Exodus.

II. If the Deiſts think to come in here betwixt us, and conclude both to be falſe miracles, at leaſt that we cannot be ſure they are true miracles, becauſe, as they philoſophiſe, we do not know the utmoſt extent of the power of nature, and conſequently cannot know what exceeds it.

Anſw. 1. This is an objection not againſt the miracles recorded of Moſes or of Chriſt, but againſt all miracles; and putting it out of God's power to ſhew any miracle, that ought to be believed of man: which is a contradiction to the principles of the Deiſts themſelves, who allow an Eternal Being of infinite power; and yet, by this, would put it out of his power to make any external revelation to men.

2. But, in the next place, their philoſophy is not good; for though we could not know the utmoſt ſtretch of what nature can do, yet it will not follow that we cannot know what is contrary to nature in thoſe works of nature which we do know. For example; though I cannot tell all the whole nature of fire, and all its operations, yet this I certainly know, that it is of the nature of fire to burn; and therefore if proper fuel be adminiſtered unto it, it is contrary to the nature of fire not to conſume it. Thus when Ananias, Azarias, and Miſael, were thrown into the burning fiery furnace, if that matter of fact be true in all its circumſtances, as it is related in the third chapter of Daniel, we can be ſure that there was a ſtop there put to the natural power of fire, which is a miracle. We can be as ſure of it, as of any thing we either ſee or hear. So that the ſame ſcepticiſm which theſe men advance againſt miracles, will, as much, take away the certainty of our outward ſenſes; which is the only poſtulatum they would have taken as undoubted; and to which they reduce all the certainty of which

mankind

mankind is capable; giving to themſelves, by their great ſenſe, little pre-eminence above the condition of brutes; to which they would degrade all the reſt of the world with themſelves; and ſome of them have ſhewn their parts in witty ſatires upon the ſubject. But let us leave them with the company they have choſen, and return.

As ſure as we can be that it is the nature of fire to burn, (though we may not know every thing elſe it can do) ſo ſure we can be that it exceeds the power of nature to raiſe the dead, by the ſpeaking of a word; to cure the lame, blind, &c. by the ſame means, or the touch of one's finger, without any other application.

III. Now then, the miracles recorded of Chriſt, being as great as thoſe recorded of Moſes, and carrying along with them the ſame evidences of their truth, deduced down from that time to this, what reaſon can be given for the believing of the one, and yet rejecting of the other? There can be none, my friends, only there are ſome prejudices under which you labour, that ſtop your way towards receiving of the truth, which you cannot deny, as conceiving it inconſiſtent with your interpretation of ſome texts in your law.

But ought we not rather to ſuſpect your own interpretations (eſpecially where the words will favourably bear another) than to reject ſuch an evidence as muſt undermine your law itſelf, and deſtroy its infallible certainty, by diſowning the ſame, in the only caſe that carries the ſame demonſtration along with it? God cannot contradict himſelf; and therefore would never have ſet his own ſeal (which it is not poſſible to counterfeit, as before is ſhewn) to the truth of the Goſpel, if it did, in the leaſt iota, contradict or deſtroy the law; therefore, it behoves you well to conſider, whether thoſe things that you take for contradictions are ſuch. In order to which,

1. Conſider the difference betwixt deſtroying and fulfilling. The fulfilling of a prophecy, is not its deſtruction, but completion. So of all types or ſhadows, which point

at

at things to come; when the ſubſtance is come, the ſhadow ceaſes of courſe.

Now, if the Meſſiah was propheſied of, and typified in the law, then his coming will indeed put an end to theſe; but not by way of deſtroying, which would be contradicting, but of fulfilling them, which is confirming, and atteſting to the truth of them. And I ſuppoſe you are not ignorant that our Meſſiah did not pretend to deſtroy the law, but to fulfil it; and did moſt ſtrongly aſſert and confirm it (*a*), to the leaſt iota: and did fulfil it (*b*), in every circumſtance, even to his ſuffering without the gate (*c*), to anſwer the burning of the body of the expiatory ſacrifice, without the camp (*d*), &c. That, as himſelf ſaid (*e*), "all things "might be fulfilled, which were written in the law of "Moſes, and in the Prophets, and in Pſalms, concerning "him." Some of which are repeated hereafter, Sect. XII.

2. But I will carry this argument further: That not only there is no contradiction to the law in the Goſpel, but that the law cannot be true, unleſs you allow the truth of the Goſpel. For no other way poſſible is there to reconcile the promiſes made in the law, but as they are fulfilled in the Goſpel; of which let me give ſome few inſtances out of many.

1. (*f*) "The ſcepter ſhall not depart from Judah, nor a "law-giver from between his feet, until Shiloh come; and "unto him ſhall the gathering of the people, (or nations) be."

This the Chaldee and ancient Jewiſh interpreters do underſtand of the Meſſiah.

And the ſcepter being long ſince departed from Judah; and no other Meſſiah come, but our Lord Jeſus Chriſt; to whom the gathering of the nations, or Gentiles, has been; the rabbies of the Jews, ſince his coming, have ſtrained their wits to invent ſalvo's and evaſions for this prophecy. Some of them ſay, that by Shiloh here was not meant the Meſſiah, but Moſes. Others ſay, it was the tabernacle at Shiloh. But others, thinking theſe interpretations not

(*a*) Matth. v. 17, 18, 19. (*b*) Luke xvi. 17. (*c*) Heb. xiii. 12. (*d*) Lev. xvi. 27. (*e*) Luke xxiv. 44. (*f*) Gen. xlix. 10.

tenable,

tenable, and that it cannot be denied to be meant of the Meſſiah, have fenced about the word ſcepter, which they contend to be a rod, not of rule, but of correction, which ſhould not depart from Judah till Shiloh, or the Meſſiah, ſhould come. Others, not liking this, allow it to be a ſcepter of government; but then turn it this way, viz. that the ſcepter ſhould not finally, or for ever, depart from Judah, becauſe the Meſſiah ſhould come, that is, to reſtore it. But this being an altering inſtead of expounding the text, others ſeeing there could not be any tolerable evaſion made from the words of the text, have boldly adventured upon a new way of ſatisfying it, viz. that the ſcepter, or dominion, is not yet departed; that is, not totally; for that ſome of them have, ſomewhere or other, ſome ſhare or other of government, or juriſdiction more or leſs; at leaſt, ſome that have, ſome way or other, deſcended from the tribe of Judah, though it may not be known.

I will not take up time to examine or diſprove theſe pretences. They carry guilt in their face: and being all contradictory to one another, ſhew to what a confuſion the Jews are brought, in forcing their way through the plain predictions of the Meſſiah, of which I will go on to more inſtances.

2. (*g*) "Thus ſaith the Lord, David ſhall never want a "man to ſit upon the throne of the houſe of Iſrael: nei- "ther ſhall the prieſts, the Levites, want a man before me "to offer burnt-offerings, and to kindle meat-offerings, and "to do ſacrifice continually:—Thus ſaith the Lord, if ye "can break my covenant of the day, and my covenant of "the night, and that there ſhould not be day and night in "their ſeaſon; then may alſo my covenant be broken with "David my ſervant, that he ſhould not have a ſon to reign "upon this throne, and with the Levites, the prieſts, my "miniſters." Now is all this glorioufly fulfilled in our Meſſiah, the Son of David, who is made Lord of heaven and earth, and of whoſe kingdom there ſhall be no end.

(*g*) Jer. xxxiii. 17, 18, 20, 21.

But

But without this, how is this prophecy fulfilled? What ſon of David can you produce, who now reigns over the houſe of Iſrael? And as for the covenant with Levi, that is as much broken; for inſtead of ſacrifices CONTINUALLY, you have not now, nor have had ſince the deſtruction of Jeruſalem, about ſeventeen hundred years, any ſacrifice at all. But if you underſtand theſe prophecies, as of the kingdom of the Meſſiah, ſo of his prieſthood, of which that of Levi was a type, and fulfilled in it, then is this prophecy exactly accompliſhed in the evangelical prieſthood, which our Meſſiah has inſtituted; and which, we doubt not, will, according to the utmoſt extent of this prophecy of it, laſt as long as the covenant of day and night; that is, as our Meſſiah has again given us his aſſurance, (*h*) "even unto the end of the "world;" and that "the gates of hell ſhall" never be able to "prevail againſt it." Some of the * Jews pretend, that David will be raiſed from the dead, and made immortal, to fulfil this prophecy. But others, rejecting this interpretation, ſay, that this is to be meant of the time after the Meſſiah, ſc. That after the Meſſiah ſhall come, of the ſeed of David, there ſhall no more want of his ſeed to rule, &c. But the words of the text are, that David ſhall never want a man to ſit upon the throne of the houſe of Iſrael. And putting to this, after the coming of the Meſſiah, is adding to the text. And the like liberty would leave nothing certain in any text of the Bible, or in any other writing. The next I produce is,

3. That moſt exact deſcription (*i*) of the death and ſufferings of the Meſſiah, with the reaſon of it, viz. as an expiation and ſatisfaction for the ſins of the people.

And how forced and foreign is that interpretation which ſome of your modern Jews have put upon this chapter, on purpoſe to avoid the plain proof of our Meſſiah therein? As if the perſon there ſpoke of were not any particular perſon, but only a deſcription of the people of the Jews, in the

(*h*) Matth. xxviii. 20. xvi. 18. * Limboreh Collat. p. 73.
(*i*) Iſaiah liii.

name

name of a perſon; of their preſent diſperſion through all nations; with the contempt and miſery which they ſuffer; and withal their making many proſelytes to their religion, in this their diſperſion.

For their many proſelytes, we hear not of them. If the Jews keep their own ground, it is the moſt that in your preſent circumſtances, you ſeem to expect: and would be well content to compound for it, not only here, but in all the countries whither you are diſperſed. What king, what nation, have you converted? Nay, in our part of the world, what family, what perſons? And we hear as little of it from other parts. You boaſt of many in Spain and Portugal; but they conceal it, and we know them not. But the flowing in of the Gentiles has been to the Chriſtian church. And only ſo, can the promiſe of it to your church be verified, that is, as yours was a type of ours; or as ours is truly yours, fulfilled and continued, in the reign of your Meſſiah, purſuant to all the prophecies which went before of him. Therefore by all that has yet appeared of your diſperſion, it is as a juſt puniſhment for your own ſins, and not for the converſion of the Gentiles. But how for their converſion? When your learned Jew confeſſes (as hereafter quoted) that you have no arguments againſt the Gentiles, nor can convince any of them. And in all the prophecies of this your diſperſion, (ſome of which are recited Sect. xi.) there is nothing told of the converſion of the Gentiles as thereby deſigned, but only as a puniſhment of your iniquity; and, at the length, for your converſion, as well as that of the Gentiles. As that God will have mercy upon you, and cauſe your captivity (*k*) to return. That the Redeemer (*l*) ſhall come to Zion, and turn away iniquity from Jacob. And in the mean time, that you ſhould be rejected for your wickedneſs, and another people choſen in your place. For thus it is ſaid to you, (*m*) "But ye are they that forſake the "Lord—Therefore will I number you to the ſword— "Becauſe when I called, ye did not anſwer; when I ſpake,

(*k*) Jer. xxxiii. 26. (*l*) Iſaiah lix. 20. (*m*) Iſaiah lxv. 11. to 15.

" you did not hear"—(ye did not hearken to the words of the Lord, in the mouth of that prophet whom he told you he would ſend) " Therefore thus ſaith the Lord God (*n*), " behold my ſervants ſhall eat, but ye ſhall be hungry; " behold my ſervants ſhall drink, but ye ſhall be thirſty; " behold my ſervants ſhall rejoice, but ye ſhall be aſhamed; " behold my ſervants ſhall ſing for joy of heart, but ye " ſhall cry for ſorrow of heart, and ſhall howl for vexation " of ſpirit. And ye ſhall leave your name for a curſe unto " my choſen: for the Lord God ſhall ſlay thee, and call " his ſervants by another name." How literally is this fulfilled! God hath choſen the Chriſtians in your place, and called his ſervants by another name. Not that you ſhould be finally rejected, but till the fulneſs of the Gentiles ſhall come in: and then ſhall you be converted by them, and not they by you. Therefore are you fatally deluded, who attribute to yourſelves, and to your preſent circumſtances, all that righteouſneſs which is ſpoken of the Meſſiah in liiid of Iſaiah. As, " By his knowledge ſhall my righteous ſervant juſtify " many, &c." Was it for this end that God foretold your diſperſion? No; but for your grievous iniquities, and for your own converſion. As ſaid by a prophet of your own, (*o*) " Yet will I leave a remnant, that ye may have " *ſome* that ſhall eſcape the ſword, among the nations, when " ye ſhall be ſcattered through the countries: and they that " eſcape of you ſhall remember me among the nations— " Becauſe I am broken with their whoriſh heart, which " have departed from me—And they ſhall loath themſelves " for the evils which they have committed in all their abo- " minations: and they ſhall know that I am the Lord, and " that I have not ſaid in vain, that I would do this evil " unto them." Again, (*p*) " They ſhall know that I am " the Lord, when I ſhall ſcatter them among the nations, " and diſperſe them in the countries: but I will leave men " of number of them—that they may declare all their abo- " minations among the Heathen, whither they come, and

(*n*) Deut. xviii. 18, 19. (*o*) Ezek. vi. 8, 9, 10. (*p*) Ibid. xii. 15, 16.

" they ſhall know that I am the Lord:" That is, you Jews ſhall know. It is to convince and convert *you*, that you ſhall be ſo diſperſed, as you are this day. Again, (q) " Are ye not as children of the Ethiopians unto me, O " children of Iſrael, ſaith the Lord?—Behold the eyes of " the Lord God are upon the ſinful kingdom, and I will " deſtroy it from off the face of the earth; ſaving that I " will not utterly deſtroy the houſe of Jacob, ſaith the " Lord: for lo I will command, and I will ſift the houſe " of Iſrael among all nations, like as corn is ſifted in a " ſieve, yet ſhall not the leaſt grain fall upon the earth."

You ſhall be preſerved in your diſperſion, in order to your repentance, not for your holineſs, to convert the nations; for you are called the ſinful kingdom, and as children of the Ethiopians. And God will chooſe other hands to raiſe his kingdom among the Heathen; as it follows, (r) " In that day I will raiſe up the tabernacle of David that " is fallen—That they may poſſeſs the remnant of Edom, " and of all the Heathen, which are called by my name, " ſaith the Lord that doth this." See that fulfilled this day. Where are the Heathens that are called by the name of the Lord? Who does poſſeſs them but our Meſſiah, the Son of David, by whoſe name they are called Chriſtians? In vain therefore do you expect the Heathen to be converted by *you*. You ſee it done already, by thoſe whom God has choſen in your room; and who now ſeeks to convert you, by perſuading of you to hearken to Moſes and your own prophets, who have told you of this converſion of the Gentiles, while you remain in your obſtinacy. (s) " I am " ſought of them that aſked not for me; I am found of " them that ſought me not; I ſaid behold me, behold me, " unto a nation that was not called by my name." But unto Iſrael he ſaith, " I have ſpread out my hands all the " day unto a rebellious and gainſaying people." Yet you would attribute great holineſs to yourſelves in this your diſ-

(q) Amos ix. 7, 8, 9. (r) Ibid. ver. 11, 12. (s) Iſaiah lxv. 1, 2.

perſion,

perſion, even all that which is ſpoken of the Meſſiah in the fifty-third chapter of Iſaiah.

I have inſiſted thus long upon it, becauſe this is all you have to ſay againſt that wonderful prophecy of the law, outward appearance of the Meſſiah when he ſhould come; and of the end of his coming, not fighting, (as you expect) but ſuffering: not conquering men with the ſword, but, as it is there expreſſed, (ver. 10.) "Giving up his ſoul, an offering "for ſin;" whereby to redeem us from that death denounced (*t*) againſt ſin: and ſo conquering him that had the power of death, that is, the devil, to whom we were in bondage, lying under the curſe, of which he was made the executioner.

And this (till the time ſhould come) was ſhadowed out to us in ſeveral types and repreſentations of it, not only in your law, which was but one of them; for ſacrifices (the moſt expreſs type of the death and ſacrifice of the Meſſiah) were inſtituted upon the firſt ſin of man, and the promiſes of the Meſſiah (*u*) then given, and his conqueſt of the ſerpent, and were practiſed by Cain, Abel, Noah, Abraham, &c. before the law; but moſt lively expreſſed (*x*) in the ſacrifice of Iſaac, upon which the promiſe of the Meſſiah was again renewed to Abraham. This ſalvation by the Meſſiah was likewiſe prefigured by the ſaving of Noah and his family in the ark; as by your paſſage through the Red-Sea, and deliverance out of Egypt; particularly by the erection of the brazen ſerpent, as of Chriſt upon the croſs; and your ſalvation only by looking upon that, as ours by faith in him. But theſe types may be over-valued, when we reſt in them, without looking forward to what they repreſent. Therefore Hezekiah (*y*) broke that brazen ſerpent to pieces, and called it Nehuſhtan, a contemptible name, that is, only a bit of braſs: and God expreſſes himſelf with as much indignation againſt your ſacrifices, as inſufficient, of themſelves, to reconcile to him. In which ſenſe he declares (*z*)

(*t*) Gen. ii. 17. (*u*) Gen. iii. 15. (*x*) Gen. xxii. 18.
(*y*) 2 Kings xviii. 4. (*z*) Iſaiah i. 11 to 15.

that he hates them; that they are a trouble and an abomination to him, and that he is weary to bear them; and that he will not accept of them, or has required them as a ſatisfaction for ſin. What is it then that he will accept? Even the Meſſiah (*a*), for whom a body was prepared in which he was to make that atonement, in which the bodies of beaſts could not; and which is very particularly deſcribed in the fifty-third chapter of Iſaiah, and cannot be applied to the Jewiſh nation (as they would now turn it) under their preſent ſufferings and calamity. It is ſaid, ver. 12. "He "bore the ſin of many, and made interceſſion for the tranſ- "greſſors." Do the Jews make interceſſion for the Gentiles? or how do they bear their ſins? It is ſaid, ver. 9. "He had done no violence, neither was any deceit in his "mouth; yet it pleaſed the Lord to bruiſe him, &c." But what is before recited out of your prophets, and much more could be added to the ſame purpoſe, ſhew plainly that you have been bruiſed for your own great wickedneſs. And the opinion of your own righteouſneſs is not the leaſt part of your deluſion, but you oppoſe yourſelves, and ſet up contrary pretences; for when you come to give an account why your Meſſiah has delayed his coming ſo long beyond the time which was limited by the prophets, you have no other anſwer, but that it is becauſe of your ſins; and they muſt be ſins more than ordinary, which have provoked God to break his promiſes, ſo oft repeated, concerning the time of the Meſſiah's coming. So that here you make yourſelves the greateſt ſinners that can be: but in anſwer to Iſaiah liii. then you are righteous altogether, and there is no deceit in your mouth! Your nation is the righteous ſervant of the Lord there ſpoke of!

But of that ſervant it is ſaid, ver. 8. "For the tranſgreſ- "ſion of my people was he ſtricken." Therefore he was not that people, but he ſuffered for that people.

The learned Jew * ſays, that the death which the Chriſtians would infer of the Meſſiah from this of Iſaiah liii.

(*a*) Pſal. xl. 6, 7. * Limbor. Collat. p. 53.

means not a real death, (for they ſuppoſe rightly, but miſunderſtood that their Meſſiah will live for ever) but only *labores & flagella*, (as he words it) great labours and afflictions, which they ſuppoſe he may endure, *ante perfectam regni revelationem*, before the full eſtabliſhment of his kingdom. And he brings as a parallel place, in deaths oft, which the Apoſtle (*b*) ſpeaks of himſelf, but it means no more than dangers.

Anſw. 1. The Meſſiah's undergoing ſtripes and afflictions, though in order to his kingdom, is as adverſe to the Jews notion of the Meſſiah, as death itſelf; for they ſuppoſe him to go on glorioufly in conqueſts and victory, and not to be ſcourged, or ignominiouſly treated.

Anſw. 2. being in deaths, ſhews itſelf to be a figurative expreſſion: for a man can be in death but once, therefore not, in that ſenſe, often in deaths: but as a man in battles, or ſtorms at ſea, may be ſaid to be often in deaths, ſo the Apoſtle in the many dangers which he there repeats. But far otherwiſe are the expreſſions concerning the death of the Meſſiah: (*c*) "He was cut off out of the land of the living: "—He made his grave with the wicked:—He poured out "his ſoul unto death." And Meſſiah the Prince (*d*) ſhall be cut off, but not for himſelf, &c. If theſe expreſſions do not ſignify death, what others can? And the Jews ſtruggling againſt it, ſhews only that they are reſolved not to be convinced by any words whatſoever that can be ſpoken. They try all ways, but dare ſtick to none, for they are contradictory to one another: and if one of their excuſes hold, the reſt muſt be falſe; which confuſion, of itſelf, were enough to convince them, you ſhall ſee more of them.

To avoid this, and other prophecies, which ſpeak expreſsly of the poor and low ſtate in which the Meſſiah was to appear, (*e*) Behold thy king cometh unto thee poor, or as we tranſlate it lowly, &c. The modern Jews have framed to themſelves two Meſſiahs: one Ben Joſeph, of the tribe of

(*b*) 2 Cor. xi. 23. (*c*) Iſaiah liii. 8, 9, 12. (*d*) Dan. ix. 25, 26. (*e*) Zech. ix. 2.

Ephraim,

Ephraim, who was to be poor and contemptible, and undergo great indignities: the other Ben David, of the tribe of Judah, who was to be victorious, and conquer all the earth before them, and to live for ever in temporal grandeur: that he was to raiſe again from the dead all the Iſraelites of former ages, and among them, the firſt Meſſiah Ben Joſeph. Thus the Jews ſhutting faſt their eyes, do dream and invent Meſſiahs, on purpoſe becauſe they will not be concluded by the plain prophecies of the one and only Meſſiah. Where do the prophets ſpeak of two Meſſiahs? But ſpeaking all along of one, and of the Son or Meſſiah, does neceſſarily exclude any other. If there were two, one would not be the Meſſiah; and by the ſame rule they make two, they may make two ſcore of Meſſiahs. But this ſhameleſs contrivance ſhews how hard they are put to it to elude the plain prophecies of the Meſſiah; and is a confirmation of the true import and meaning of theſe prophecies, which are not anſwerable, but by ſuch poor and guilty ſhifts. It is for this reaſon that I have been ſo long upon this prophecy of Iſaiah, and ſhewn the dream of your modern rabbies, of two Meſſiahs, unknown to all your expoſitors before Chriſt came, but invented ſince, on purpoſe to avoid the plain and undoubted characters which our Jeſus bore of the Meſſiah.

4. The famous prophecy of Daniel's (*f*) ſeventy weeks; which, according to the prophetical computation of a year for a day, makes four hundred and ninety years. In which time it was then foretold that the Meſſiah ſhould come, and our Meſſiah did come within that time; and all there ſpoken of him were punctually fulfilled; as, that the Meſſiah ſhould be cut off; and ſoon after, that the city of Jeruſalem and the ſanctuary ſhould be deſtroyed, and the ſacrifice and oblation ſhould ceaſe; and that even after all this, deſolations were determined againſt your nation.

And the end of the Meſſiah's coming is likewiſe there told; not temporal conqueſts, as you dream of, but, "To

(*f*) Dan. ix. 24, &c.

" finiſh the tranſgreſſions, and to make an end of ſins, and " to make reconciliation for iniquity, and to bring in ever- " laſting righteouſneſs."

This prophecy pinches ſo cloſe, that the modern Jews, to avoid it, would endeavour to diſcredit the whole book of Daniel: they dare not quite throw it off, becauſe it was indubitably received by their forefathers before Chriſt came; and the high rank (*g*) in which Daniel is put, rather gives him the preference before all the reſt of the prophets, than excludes him out of their number. It makes him at leaſt the moſt highly favoured of God, of all the men living in the world in his time; and his viſions of the four great empires of the world, and prophecies of the ſtate-revolutions which followed ſo remarkably, made his prophecies more noted than thoſe of any of the other prophets. And God (*h*) ſets him forth as the ſtandard of wiſdom amongſt men: for theſe reaſons, the Jews after Chriſt could not expunge this book of Daniel; but about a hundred years after Chriſt, they quite inverted the method of the books of the Old Teſtament, which to that time had been received amongſt them, and made a new diſtribution of them; and a diſtinction of thoſe they called Ἁγιόγραφα, or holy writings, but put them in a claſs below the inſpired and canonical Scriptures; and into this lower claſs they thruſt the book of Daniel at the end of the prophets, which before was placed in the middle of them.

But this book of Daniel, if it be not among thoſe which are inſpired in the higheſt degree, it cannot ſtand among any holy or good writings, but it muſt be reckoned falſe and blaſphemous, becauſe it ſpeaks of itſelf all along as immediately inſpired by God: and if thoſe viſions and revelations there related be not true, then it is telling of lies in the name of the Lord, which is high blaſphemy.

Therefore ſince the modern Jews dare not place the book of Daniel lower than among the holy or pious writings, they confeſs it to be inſpired and canonical; and have only

(*g*) Ezek. xiv. 14, 20. (*h*) Ibid. xxviii. 3.

diſcovered

diſcovered their own guilt in ſeeking to avoid the witneſs of their own prophets to our Meſſiah.

5. That promiſe (*i*) concerning the temple of Solomon, that God's name ſhould be there for ever, and perpetually, cannot be verified, but as it was a type of the Chriſtian church, which ſhall laſt for ever. For types, as pictures, are often called by the name of what they repreſent; and by them is meant that whereof they are the types.

6. As that promiſe to the temple of Solomon, ſo neither can that made to the ſecond temple be otherwiſe verified than as fulfilled in our Meſſiah: (*k*) that "the glory of this "latter houſe ſhall be greater than of the former." And yet it was nothing in compariſon of the former. How then ſhould the glory be greater? It is told, becauſe "The "deſire of all nations ſhould come into it," and "In "this place will I give peace, ſaith the Lord of Hoſts." Here was given the eternal peace and reconciliation of God with men, in the perſon of Jeſus Chriſt, in whom God was, by his means, "reconciling (*l*) the world unto himſelf."

Some Jews, to avoid the force of this prophecy, do now pretend, that, by the "latter houſe," ver. 9, is not to be meant that ſecond temple, but ſome other yet to be built. This is very precarious, and a guilty plea; but it will not bear; for it is plain that it was of that very ſecond temple which the prophet ſpoke. The compariſon, ver. 3, is betwixt that temple which they then ſaw, and the firſt temple of Solomon. And ver. 7, God ſpeaking of that temple then built, ſays, "I will fill this houſe with glory." And ver. 9, "The glory of this latter houſe ſhall be greater "than of the former." If it were ſpoken of a third or a fourth temple, the word *former* would not relate to the firſt temple; and there was no other former, when this prophecy was given forth. It was the ſecond temple that ſeemed as nothing in the eyes of thoſe who had ſeen the firſt, who therefore wept (*m*); and, to comfort theſe, it was here pro-

(*i*) 2 Chron. vii. 16. (*k*) Hag. ii. 3, 7, 9. (*l*) 2 Cor. v. 19.
(*m*) Ezra iii. 12.

miſed, that the glory of that ſecond houſe ſhould exceed that of the former.

But there were other glories much greater than that of the building, which the firſt temple had, and the ſecond had none of them; as your own rabbies* do reckon them under five heads. 1. The holy ark, wherein were the tables of the covenant, the pot of manna, and Aaron's rod that budded: and where God was ſaid to dwell between the cherubims that covered it (*n*). 2. The ſchechina, or divine preſence in the cloud of glory. 3. The miraculous Urim and Thummim. 4. The holy fire that came down from heaven. 5. The gift of prophecy, or of the Holy Ghoſt. Theſe all ceaſed under the ſecond temple, which made its glory much more inferior to that of the firſt, than the difference as to the magnificence of the building. But all theſe glories were much exceeded under the ſecond temple; they were fulfilled, and more divinely exhibited in their architype the Meſſiah, who was the true ſchechina, God not only appearing in, but perſonally united to our nature, whoſe holy Spirit deſcended miraculouſly in fire upon his Apoſtles, the ſame day (of pentecoſt) wherein the law was given in fire from Mount Sinai, and filled them with the gifts of tongues, of miracles, and of prophecy, which were now departed from the temple, and placed that infallible Urim and Thummim in their hearts, which was but faintly repreſented in the breaſt-plate of your high-prieſt.

7. Again of this ſecond temple it was ſaid, (*o*) "The "Lord whom ye ſeek, ſhall ſuddenly come to his temple; "even the angel of the covenant whom ye delight in: "behold he ſhall come, ſaith the Lord of Hoſts." Therefore it was neceſſary that the Meſſiah ſhould come during the ſtanding of the ſecond temple; and that prophecy can never now be fulfilled.

You have ſeveral times attempted to rebuild your temple, in the reigns of Adrian, of Conſtantine, of Julian; when

* R. Kimchi. & R. Solom. in Hag. i. 8. and R. Bechai in Legem, f. 59.
(*n*) Pſal. lxxx. 1. (*o*) Mal. iii. 1.

having gained not only that apoſtate emperor's conſent, but that he was willing to bear the expences of it, and gave orders for the re-building of your temple at Jeruſalem, in odium to the Chriſtians, and the Heathens did with great zeal (for the ſame reaſon) aſſiſt you in it, even then, when you ſeemed on all hands to have gained your purpoſe, behold God did immediately himſelf interpoſe! and by a terrible earthquake threw up the ſtones out of the very foundation with that violence, as deſtroyed many of the workmen and ſpectators; and by overthrowing the buildings near adjoining to the temple, killed and maimed many more of the Jews, who were there gathered together, for the carrying on of this work.

And when not terrified with this, they again attempted to lay the foundations of the temple, globes of fire burſting out of the very foundations, not only deſtroyed the workmen, but devoured the ſtones. This is recorded in Socrat. Hiſt. Eccl. l. 3. c. 20. and in Sozom. l. 5. c. 22. who appeals to ſeveral witneſſes of it, then living. And our Chryſoſtome (*p*) ſays, We are all witneſſes of this thing. But beſides theſe teſtimonies of Chriſtians, this is likewiſe told by Ammianus Marcellinus, who was not a Chriſtian, in his xxiiid book. Thus the building of the temple was defeated at that time A. C. 361, and to this day; though if you had a new temple to-morrow, that could not ſolve the prophecies that were made either to the firſt or ſecond temple, which laſt has been deſtroyed now more than ſixteen hundred years; much leſs could it ſatisfy all thoſe prophecies that ſpeak ſo particularly of the time of the Meſſiah's coming, which are longer ſince paſt.

IV. The prophecies of the holy Scriptures concerning the time of the coming of the Meſſiah, were ſo noted and known among the Jews, that when it drew near, viz. about the time that our bleſſed Saviour came into the world, the Jews were generally looking out for him, and expected his coming. Some thought that Herod (who repaired the tem-

(*p*) Orat. 2. contr. Jud.

ple, and made it more glorious) was he, and took the name of Herodians. Others followed Theudas; others Judas of Galilee.

Both of which are mentioned (*q*) in our history of the Acts of the Apostles, and likewise (*r*) by your Josephus: if it was not another Theudas, who, as he tells, pretended to miracles, viz. to divide the river Jordan, by his command, and give his followers passage through it, on dry land. He mentions (*s*) another impostor, who led the Jews into the wilderness, and promised them deliverance, if they would follow him thither; whom Festus destroyed, with all his followers. This our Saviour literally (*t*) foretold, and cautions against following these false Christs and false prophets into the desert: and Josephus says (*u*), that there were at that time (which was about fifty-seven or fifty-eight years after the nativity of Christ) many enchanters and deceivers, who persuaded the common people to follow them into the desert, where they promised to work miracles, &c. He says that the country of Judea was stored with such; so intent were they then to find out their Messiah, and so persuaded that that was the time of his coming. The two brothers, (*x*) Asinæus and Anileus, both weavers, had mighty successes, but were at last destroyed, and were the occasion of the destruction of many of the Jews, who followed them about forty years after the birth of Christ. And (*y*) about seventy-four years after, another weaver, one Jonathan, led many of the Jews after him into the wilderness, where he promised to shew them signs and wonders. He was burnt alive, and multitudes of the Jews were massacred about Cyrene. This was two years after the destruction of Jerusalem. And Josephus tells (*z*), that the great cause of that was their expectation of their Messiah then to come: for he says, that the chief thing which incited them to that war (with the Ro-

(*q*) Acts v. 36, 37. (*r*) Joseph. Antiq. l. xxviii. c. 1, 2. l. xx. c. 2. (*s*) Ibid. c. 7. (*t*) Matth. xxiii. 23, 24, 25, 26. (*u*) Joseph. Antiq. l. xx. c. 6. (*x*) Ibid. l. xxviii. c. 12. (*y*) Id. de Bell. Jud. l. vii. c. 31. (*z*) Bell. Jud. l. vii. c. 12.

mans) was a doubtful prophecy (as he calls it) found in the holy Scriptures, that, about that time, one of their country ſhould be monarch of the whole world. He ſaid (after the deſtruction of Jeruſalem) that they were deceived in this interpretation of the prophecy, which he (then) applied to the reign of Veſpaſian, as if fulfilled in him.

V. But what is more remarkable, the Romans themſelves had the ſame notion current among them; and not only they, but all the Eaſtern part of the world, which may well include all that was then known. Thus ſays Suetonius, in the Life of Veſpaſian; *Percrebuerat oriente toto vetus & conſtans opinio, eſſe in fatis, ut eo tempore,* Judæa *profecti rerum potirentur*, i. e. "That an ancient and conſtant tradition had obtained throughout all the Eaſt, that in the Fates it was decreed, that, about that time, ſome who ſhould come from Judæa, ſhould obtain the dominion, or government, i. e. of the world, which the Romans then poſſeſſed." And Cornelius Tacitus (Hiſt. l. 5.) ſpeaks almoſt in the ſame words; telling of the great prodigies which preceded the deſtruction of Jeruſalem, he ſays, that many underſtood them as the forerunners of that extraordinary Perſon whom the ancient books of the prieſts did foretel ſhould come about that time from Judæa, and obtain the dominion. *Pluribus perſuaſio inerat, antiquis ſacerdotum literis contineri, eo ipſo tempore fore, ut valeſceret oriens, profectique* Judæa *rerum potirentur.*

Theſe ancient books of the prieſts muſt either mean the holy Scriptures of the Old Teſtament, in the hands of the Jewiſh prieſts, and which were known to the Romans; and if ſo, it ſhews the ſenſe of the Jews at that time, and before, that that was the time of the Meſſiah's coming: or otherwiſe, which is more probable, by theſe books were meant the oracles of the Sibyls, which were kept with great veneration by the Roman prieſts, and which very plainly foretold the coming of Chriſt, and pointed out the very time; and this raiſed ſo great an expectation and jealouſy in the Roman government, at that time, with a watchful eye, particularly upon the Jews. The ſame year that Pompey took Jeruſalem,

Jeruſalem, one of the Sibyl oracles made a great noiſe, viz. that nature was about to bring forth a king to the Romans: which, as Suetonius tells in the Life of Auguſtus, did ſo terrify the ſenate, that they made a decree, that "none born that year ſhould be educated; and that thoſe whoſe wives were with child, did each conceive great hopes, applying the prophecy to themſelves."—*Senatum exterritum cenſuiſſe, ne quis illo anno genitus educaretur, eos qui gravidas uxores haberent, quod ad ſe quiſque ſpem traheret, curaſſe ne ſenatus conſultum ad ærarium deferretur.* And Appian, Plutarch, Saluſt, and Cicero, do all ſay, that it was this prophecy of the Sibyls which ſtirred up Cornelius Lentulus at that time, he hoping that he was the man who ſhould be king of the Romans. Some applied it to Cæſar, which Cicero (*de Devotione*) after Cæſar's death ridicules, and cautions that thoſe prophecies ſhould not be interpreted of any future king to be in Rome. *Cum antiſtitibus agamus, & quidvis potius ex illis libris, quam regem proferant: quem Romæ poſt hæc nec Dii, nec homines eſſe patiuntur.* Virgil, in his famous IVth Eclogue, wrote about the beginning of Herod the Great, compliments the conſul Pollio with this prophecy, by ſuppoſing it might refer to his ſon Saloninus, then born; but the words are too great to be verified of any mere mortal man: and ſpeaks of ſuch a golden age, and renovation of all things, as cannot be fulfilled in the reign of any earthly king. And Virgil does expreſs it almoſt in the words of the holy Scriptures, wherein they tell of the glorious age of the Meſſiah; of new heavens and a new earth, then to begin, and to be finally compleated, at the end of the world. Iſaiah lxv. 17. 2 Pet. iii. 13.

Ultima cumæi venit jam carminis ætas:
Magnus ab integro ſæclorum naſcitur ordo.
Jam nova progenies cælo demittitur alto.
Tu modo naſcenti puero, quo ferrea primum
Deſinet, ac toto ſurget gens aurea mundo——

The

The laſt age decreed by fate is come:
And a new frame of all things does begin,
An holy progeny from heaven deſcends,
Auſpicious be his birth, which puts an end
To th' iron age, and from whence ſhall riſe
A golden ſtate, far glorious thro' the earth.

Then the poet runs a diviſion upon the peaceable ſtate of that reign, perfectly a paraphraſe of Iſaiah lxv. from ver. 17. which ends ver. 25. "The wolf and the lamb "ſhall feed together, and the lion ſhall eat ſtraw as the bul-"lock; and duſt ſhall be the ſerpent's meat. They ſhall "not hurt nor deſtroy, in all my holy mountain, ſaith the "Lord."

——nec magnos metuent armenta leones.
Occidet & ſerpens, & fallax herba veneni
Occidet.——

——Nor ſhall the flocks fierce lions fear.
No ſerpent ſhall be there, or herb of pois'nous juice.

Nay, the very atonement for our ſins, which Daniel attributed to the Meſſiah, chap. ix. 24. "To finiſh the tranſ-"greſſion, to make an end of ſins, and to make reconcilia-"tion for iniquity," is thus expreſſed in this Eclogue:

Te duce, ſi qua manent ſceleris veſtigia noſtri,
Irrita perpetua ſolvent formidine terras.

By thee, what footſteps of our ſins remain
Are blotted out, and the whole world ſet free
From her perpetual bondage, and her fear.

And the very words of Haggai ii. 6. ſeem to be literally tranſlated by Virgil. Thus ſays the prophet of the coming of the Meſſiah, "Yet once, it is a little while, and I will "ſhake the heavens, and the earth, and the ſea, and the "dry

" dry land. And I will ſhake all nations, and the deſire " of all nations ſhall come." And thus the poet,

Aggredere O magnos (aderit jam tempus) honores,
Chara Deum ſoboles, magnum Jovis incrementum.
Aſpice convexo nutantem pondere mundum,
Terraſque, tractuſque Maris, Cœlumque profundum.
Aſpice venturo lætentur ut omnia ſeclo.

Enter on thy high honour, now's the time,
Offspring of God, O thou great gift of Jove.
Behold the world, heaven, earth, and ſeas do ſhake,
Behold how all rejoice to greet that glorious age.

And, as if Virgil had been learned in the doctrine of Chriſt, he tells, that theſe glorious times ſhould not begin immediately upon the birth of that wonderful perſon, then expected to come into the world; but that wickedneſs ſhould ſtill keep its ground in ſeveral places.

Pauca tamen ſuberunt priſcæ veſtigia fraudis.
——— *erunt etiam altera Bella.*

Yet ſome remains ſhall ſtill be left
Of ancient fraud, and wars ſhall ſtill go on.

Now how Virgil applied all this is not the matter; whether in part to Auguſtus, or partly to Pollio, and partly to Saloninus his ſon, then newly born; but it ſhews the general expectation that there was at that time of the birth of a moſt extraordinary perſon, who ſhould introduce a new and golden age, and both reform and govern the whole world; juſtly, therefore, called by the prophet the " deſire of all " nations."

Now the Sibyls had pointed out the time to be then at hand. And if it ſhould be ſuppoſed (though there is no reaſon for it) that the Jews had forged or interpolated theſe oracles, and made them ſpeak thus in the language of the holy Scriptures, yet this ſtill ſhews, that the Jews, at that time, did ſo underſtand the prophecies of the Old Teſtament, concerning the Meſſias, as that then was the time prefixed for his coming.

But

But if these prophecies of the Sybils be what they speak themselves (against which nothing but presumption has yet appeared) then can they not be denied as a demonstrative proof of our Jesus being the Messiah; for they describe him so personally and so plainly, that this is made the cause of suspicion against them; as if they could not be genuine, because they speak so very plainly and particularly of Jesus Christ.

This has carried some Christian critics too far, to reject, upon this only presumption, the authority of the Sybyls. And yet they have not (not any of them that I can find) taken into due consideration, the answer which Origen gives to this same objection of theirs, for it is not a new one. It was first objected by the Heathens. Celsus had recourse to this, alleging, that the Christians had interpolated and added several things to the prophecies of the Sibyls. But Origen * appeals to the ancient copies of them, and challenges Celsus, or any of the Heathens, to shew what was added; which, he says, they could not instance; and that certainly they would if they could. Yet some of our critics have declared themselves, in this, for Celsus against Origen; but without answering of Origen's argument, which Celsus could not. And it is not to be imagined that Origen would have put the issue upon such a plain matter of fact, if it had not been true; and which could have been so easily disproved.

But this especially is to be considered, that the primitive fathers of the church, as Justin, Clemens, Theophilus, Athenagoras, Origen, Eusebius, Lactantius, &c. did lay so great stress upon the Sibyls, and quoted them so often against the Heathens, that they called the Christians Sibyllanists. Clemens Alexandrinus, in his Stromat. l. 6. quotes St. Paul (some work of his now lost) in his disputations with the Gentiles, referring them to their own Sibyls. And he lived

* Ἀποφαίνομεν, ὅτι παρεσπάρκαμεν εἰς τὰ ἰδιώτικα πολλὰ καὶ βλάσφημα· καὶ μὴ ἀποδείξας μηδ' ὅτι παρεσπάρκαμεν. Ἀποδείξει δ' ἂν, εἰ τὰ Ἀρχαιότερα ἀντιγράφα ἐκείνων, ἃ ἂν ἔχοιτα ἄνθρ οἵονται παρεγγεγράφθαι, μὴ ἀποδείξας δὲ μηδ' ὅτι βλάσφημά ἐστι ταῦτα. Orig. *contra* Cels. l. 7.

near

near to the time of St. Paul; ſo that we muſt ſuppoſe this to have been at leaſt the current opinion of that early age of St. Clement. This is obſerved, *obiter*, for the ſake of ſome Chriſtian critics, who ſeem not to have a due regard for the authority of the primitive fathers of the church.

But as to what concerns you Jews, and the preſent ſubject we are upon; there can be no diſpute, by what is quoted out of the Sibyls, by ſeveral authors, before Chriſt came, that they ſpoke of a wonderful perſon to appear in the world, who ſhould rule all nations: and that it was underſtood, as well by the then Jews, as Romans, to be about that time in which our Jeſus was born. Now there could be none but Jews or Heathens to have made theſe prophecies of the Sibyls, (there being no Chriſtians then in the world) and, as ſaid before, it is all one, as to our preſent argument, whether the one or the other made them; for I bring them now only to ſhew, that there was a general expectation of the Meſſiah at that time when our Jeſus was born; and I have ſhewn that it was univerſal all the world over; the greateſt part of which was then under the Roman government; who likewiſe teſtify, that all the eaſtern part of the world had the ſame expectation.

And that, not only at that time, as if then put into their heads (by the craft or artifice of the Jews, as ſome fanciful men have pleaſed themſelves to imagine) but that they had it all along as an ancient and undoubted tradition, written in the books of fate: and that it ſhould come to paſs at that very time. And never but at that time was there any ſuch general expectation.

This univerſal impulſe (if we will call it no more) which was imprinted, in whatever manner, upon the minds of the whole earth, to expect a glorious and wonderful Deliverer, Reſtorer, and King of the world, at that time, when our bleſſed Lord and Saviour was born, (and never before or ſince) cannot be made of leſs account, than a very extraordinary, and even divine apparatus, or preparing of the way, whereby to introduce the Son of God with the general expectation and commotion of whole nature, into the world!

And

And, among all these, the expectation was most firm, as there was most reason, with you, the Jews, who had the lively oracles of the holy Scriptures; which punctually pointed out the time wherein God had decreed to send his great Messiah into the world.

This appears, with a flagrant evidence, in your setting up, at that time, this and that person for the Messiah (as I have before shewn out of Josephus) and so continued to the destruction of Jerusalem.

And since that time you have not desisted looking out for your Messiah, and following every impostor, that with any, or no pretence set himself up for it; as our Lord, your true Messiah, has foretold to you, that many would come in his name, saying, I am Christ. "Behold (says he) (*a*) "I have told you before;" but you would not believe; and it was turned to your destruction.

VI. The History of these False Messiahs has been lately wrote by Johannes à Lent, and printed at Herborn 1697, with sufficient vouchers from the rabbies of the Jews themselves. Let me but name them, to shew the succession of delusion in the Jews. You have heard before, out of Josephus, the multitudes of false Messiahs before the destruction of Jerusalem. A. C. 114, you set up another, in the reign of Trajan; one Andrew, which occasioned the destruction of many thousands of you. Again, in the reign of Adrian, another, whom ye called Bar Cohab, *i. e.* the son of a star; alluding to the star of Jacob, Num. xxiv. 17. And again rebelling under this Messiah, caused a most dreadful destruction amongst you, insomuch that, as yourselves have told it in your own books, there was twice the number of Jews that perished upon this occasion more than all those that came out of Egypt; and that you suffered more under Adrian than under Nebuchadnezzar or Titus. When you were at last undeceived (too late) then you changed the name of this false Messiah, from Bar Cochab, the son of a star, to Bar Cosibah, *i. e.* the son of a lye, as being a false Messiah.

(*a*) Matth. xxiv. 25.

And

And how oft have you been deceived ſince? In the year of Chriſt 434, in the reign of Theodoſius the younger, another Pſeudo-Meſſiah aroſe in the iſland of Crete, who ſaid, that he was Moſes, and ſent from heaven to carry the Jews in Crete, on dry ground, through the ſea, and perſuaded ſeveral of them to throw themſelves into the ſea.

In the year of Chriſt 520, another Pſeudo-Meſſiah, one Dunaan, aroſe in Arabia, and, with the Jews who followed him, ſet upon the biſhop and Chriſtians in Negræ, and committed great outrages, till he was deſtroyed.

A. C. 529, the Jews and Samaritans in Paleſtine were ſeduced into rebellion by Julian, a Pſeudo-Meſſiah, which occaſioned the deſtruction of many of them.

And when Mahomet appeared, about the year 620, the Jews flocked to him, as their Meſſiah, to which he at firſt pretended; and they ſtuck to him, till, as ſome ſay, they ſaw him eat camel's blood; or, as others tell, for other reaſons, they left him. Indeed he left them, and ſet up other pretences.

After, A. C. 721, they followed a certain Syrian, who ſaid that he was Chriſt.

A. C. 1137, they followed another in France, which occaſioned their baniſhment out of that country, and the ſlaughter of great numbers of them.

The year following, viz. A. C. 1138, in Perſia, a falſe Meſſiah taking arms, brought great miſchiefs upon the Jews there.

A. C. 1157, the Jews riſing under another Meſſiah, in Spain, had well nigh all of them been cut off.

A. C. 1167, they ſuffered much under another Meſſiah, in the kingdom of Fez.

And the ſame year, under another in Arabia, who gave for a ſign, that after his head was cut off by the king of Arabia, he would riſe to life; which he did not: but by this eſcaped a more cruel death. And not long after, in the ſame 12th century, they ſuffered much by another beyond Euphrates; who gave for his ſign, that he would go to bed at night leprous, and riſe ſound in the morning.

About

About the year 1174, another roſe in Perſia, and led the Jews into rebellion; which occaſioned great deſtruction among them. And one David Almuſar occaſioned the like to them in Moravia and Germany.

And again, in the ſame century, another Pſeudo-Meſſiah. All mentioned by Maimonides, and other Jewiſh rabbins.

Who likewiſe tells us of that moſt famous Pſeudo-Meſſiah in Perſia, called David El David, alias David Alroy, about the years 1199 or 1200, a great magician, who deluded many of the Jews.

A. C. 1222, many Jews followed a falſe Meſſiah in Germany, whom they called the ſon of David: and the ſame year expected their Meſſiah to be born of a woman, then with child, at Worms; but it proved a girl.

A. C. 1465, when the Saracens made ſuch inroads upon Chriſtendom, the Jews then thought their Meſſiah was come to fight their battles.

And the ſame year rabbi Abraham Avenaris, a Jewiſh aſtrologer, from the conjunction of Jupiter and Saturn in the ſign piſces, foretold the coming of the Meſſiah to be then at hand.

And afterwards R. Aberbanal, in his commentary upon Daniel, p. 84, 86. gathered the time of the Meſſiah's coming from the like conjunction of Jupiter and Saturn in piſces.

About the year 1497, the Jews were again deceived in Iſhmael Sopus, whom they took for their Meſſiah, who having got together an army of vile and profligate men, purſued his victories ſucceſsfully through Media, Parthia, Perſia, Meſopotamia, and Armenia. But at laſt cheated the Jews, and ſet up a new ſect for Mahomet.

A. C. 1500, rabbi Aſcher Lemla appeared in Germany, as the fore-runner of the Meſſiah, who, he promiſed, ſhould come and reſtore the Jews to the land of Canaan that ſame year. And the Jews generally, every where did believe him; and appointed public faſts and prayers to prepare for the coming of their Meſſiah.

About the year 1534, a new Meſſiah roſe up in Spain; who was burned by Charles V.

As was another at Mantua, R. Salomo Malcho; whom many of the Jews did believe came again to life after he was burned, and every ſabbath viſited his wife Zephati.

But the emperor ſpared R. David, who called himſelf one of the emiſſaries of the Meſſiah, then ſoon to come. Who, when he was at Rome, is ſaid to have faſted ſix days together.

Another Pſeudo-Meſſiah roſe up in the Eaſt-Indies about the year 1615.

And another in Holland, A. C. 1624.

But the famous Pſeudo-Meſſiah Sabethai Zevi, A. C. 1666, is a ſtory remarkably known; who, after all the expectation of the people of the Jews, turned at laſt Mahometan, to ſave his life.

And no longer ſince than the year 1682, there has got up another falſe Meſſiah, R. Mardochai, a German Jew, whom almoſt all the Jews in Italy, and many in Germany, have owned; but, like wiſe men, with due reſpect to the inquiſition, and ſelf-preſervation. Whether he be yet alive, or what ſtreſs the preſent Jews do lay upon him, I cannot tell; nor do I ſuppoſe they will be willing to own.

But, from the foregoing account, I would lay before them what a ſtrange uncertainty they are at; running after every impoſtor for their Meſſiah; having loſt all the marks whereby they may know their Meſſiah; nay, being willing they ſhould be loſt; and diſputing againſt them for this only reaſon; that becauſe all the marks given of the Meſſiah, in the Old Teſtament, do meet in our bleſſed Lord and Saviour Jeſus Chriſt, and can never meet in any other, therefore they would have no marks of him at all.

The learned Jew who diſputed with Limborch, *Anno* 1687, (five years after their laſt or preſent Meſſiah, R. Mardochia *, appeared) contends, that the prophets foretold neither the time or place of the nativity of the Meſſiah; and ſays †,

* Limb. p. 73. † Ibid. p. 55.

that miracles were not needful to prove his miſſion; but only to gather the Jews together from all parts of the world, and to conquer the nations.

Agreeable to this notion, the Pſeudo-Meſſiah before-mentioned, who aroſe in Perſia, A. C. 1138, when deſired to ſhew ſome miracle, to prove his miſſion, ſaid, that the Meſſiah was not to be known by miracles, but by his ſucceſs in conquering the world.

And your famous Maimon * ſays the ſame; that the Meſſiah was not to work miracles, but to fight the Lord's battles, and conquer all before him.

Mahomet † made the like excuſe for his not working of miracles. He ſaid, that Moſes, Solomon, and Jeſus, were ſent to ſhew God's righteouſneſs, wiſdom, and clemency, to which miracles were neceſſary to gain belief: but that he (Mahomet) was ſent to ſhew God's fortitude; to which no miracles were neceſſary, but to enforce it with the ſword; which carried its own conviction.

The guilt and folly of this excuſe is apparent. For at the firſt ſetting up of any for the Meſſiah, how ſhall it be known that he ſhall have ſucceſs? We ſee how often the Jews have been deceived and ruined by it. But do they believe that their Meſſiah ſhall have ſucceſs without interruption, all along from his firſt ſetting up? No, the learned Jew ‡ before-mentioned, interpreting the death of the Meſſiah, which is ſpoke of Iſaiah liii. only of troubles and afflictions which he ſhould endure; ſays it ſhall be in the wars with the nations, before he compleat the redemption of the Jews; and then (ſays the learned Jew) ſhall be fulfilled that propheſy of Jeremiah, *Et erit dies tribulationis* Jacob, *ſed ex ea ſalvabitur*: that the Jews ſhall ſuffer great tribulation, but ſhall be ſaved out of it: ſo that, by this rule, they cannot know their Meſſiah by his ſucceſs, till he is quite ruined and deſtroyed, and they confounded, as it has hitherto befallen them.

* II. Melac. and Milch. c. 11. † Alcoran, c. 2, 3, 4, &c.
‡ Limborch, p. 53, and 127.

One would think this enough to open their eyes; that whilſt they have obſtinately rejected the ſure and infallible marks, which God by his prophets has given of the Meſſiah, they have left to themſelves no marks or rules at all, whereby they can know him, or which do diſtinguiſh him from every impoſtor.

The Jews (*b*) in our Saviour's time, did expect that the Meſſiah, when he came, would work miracles; many of the falſe Meſſiahs pretended to it; and no doubt, the preſent Jews would think it a great confirmation of any who ſhould now ſet up for their Meſſiah. Which ſhews, that they diſpute againſt the neceſſity of miracles to vouch the Meſſiah, becauſe they cannot deny thoſe of our Saviour. And it likewiſe diſcovers their diffidence in ever having a true Meſſiah to come (whatever they pretend) becauſe they dare not put it to the iſſue of a miracle, or truſt that they ſhall have any, who ſhall be endowed with ſuch a power.

Yet they reject him, who they cannot but own had that power; and confeſs that they are ready to acknowledge another without that power: that is, they reject the ſtrongeſt credentials, and will accept of leſſer. They cannot deny this to be their caſe. They will not ſay, that they do not deſire they had a Meſſiah, who could work miracles to vouch his miſſion. And their doctors have aſſerted, that as the Meſſiah was to be greater than Moſes, ſo when he came, he ſhould work greater miracles than Moſes had done. As it is quoted out of R. Levi, Ben Gerſon, Paraſcha, by Theodorick Hackſpan, in his edition of R. Lipmann's book Nizachon. An. 1644, p. 387. Yet now they cry down miracles, as a mark of the Meſſiah, becauſe they deſpair of any ſuch; that is indeed, of any Meſſiah at all to come: for no otherwiſe can they know him, whenever they ſuppoſe that he ſhould come. They confeſs that they cannot know him by the time when he ſhould come, or by the works he ſhall do when come, other than by the iſſue of his battles; which they cannot know before-hand: and conſequently can never be ſure with whom to join, in time,

(*b*) John vii. 31.

before

before it be too late; as they have hitherto experimented in all their falſe Meſſiahs.

I would intreat them to think of another thing, as to the time of the Meſſiah's coming. They never ſet up any falſe Meſſiah, nor did any pretend to it, till near the time that our bleſſed Saviour came into the world; which was the time foretold by Daniel and the prophets. And ſince that time, they have been perpetually ſetting up of falſe Meſſiahs, one after another, even to our times. Which ſhews plainly, that the time wherein our Meſſiah did come, was the time wherein he was generally expected by the Jews: and that then they underſtood their law and their prophets in the ſame ſenſe that we have done, as to the time of the Meſſiah's coming; though now they would diſſemble it.

VII. I come now in the next place to conſider (what I have before hinted), the excuſe that you have for the delay of your Meſſiah's coming, beyond the time (as yourſelves have confeſſed) which was foretold by the prophets. And you have ſo little to ſay upon this point, that you only pretend your ſins have hindered his coming. This is a very bare, and looks like a guilty put-off. Surely it cannot ſatisfy yourſelves: for I pray you to conſider, 1. What are thoſe ſins you now complain of? They muſt be more than common ſins, that ſhould defeat ſo many expreſs and ſolemn prophecies. And by your interpretation of Iſaiah liii. (before ſpoke to) you pretend to be righteous and holy to a ſuperlative degree.

But what are thoſe ſins that ſhould prevent the coming of your Meſſiah? Are they greater than thoſe of which you were formerly guilty in the days of Moſes? (*c*) And from that time to the captivity, (2 Kings xvii. 7 to 24.) in the captivity, and after, (Ezra ix. Neh. ix. Ezek. xvi. Dan. ix. Zech. vii. and the whole Prophecy of Malachi.) No, you are not now ſo guilty of theſe idolatries and vile abominations; you have greatly reformed yourſelves from theſe; and (excepting only your rejecting of your Meſſiah,

(*c*) Read Deut. ix.

and ſtanding out ſtill againſt him) you have not now, nor have had ſince his coming, more ſins to anſwer for, or more notorious, than other men. So that this, of your ſuppoſing the coming of the Meſſiah to be delayed for your ſins, ſeems only to be an excuſe, becauſe you can find no other.

2. The coming of the Meſſiah is promiſed as a remedy for ſin. (*d*) "In that day there ſhall be a fountain opened "to the houſe of David, and to the inhabitants of Jeruſalem, "for ſin and for uncleanneſs." And what is before quoted, Dan. ix. 24. expreſſes the deſign of his coming to be, "to "make an end of ſins, and to make reconciliation for "iniquity." So that our ſins are ſo far from being a reaſon for the deferring of his coming, that they are rather an argument for the haſtening of it. The prophet Jeremy, ſpeaking of the coming of the Meſſiah, and the condition of the Jews at that time, recites their moſt horrible wickedneſs, (*e*) and of Judah worſe than Iſrael, and promiſes the new covenant of the Meſſiah, as a redemption to the penitent; when God would give them paſtors (*f*) "ac- "cording to his own heart, which ſhould feed them with "knowledge and underſtanding." And to ſhew that this was not the renewing or reſtoring of the legal diſpenſation, but the leaving it behind, for one more excellent, it is added; (*g*) "In thoſe days, ſaith the Lord, they ſhall ſay no more, "the ark of the covenant of the Lord; neither ſhall it "come to mind, neither ſhall they remember it, neither "ſhall they viſit it, neither ſhall that be done any more." And this is the time of the great wickedneſs of Iſrael. And this is according to the tradition which your rabbi Judah tells in Maſoreta, under the title de Synedrio, c. Helec. That at the time of the coming of the Son of David, the temple ſhould be a den of thieves, or unclean perſons. And that this ſhould be a time of great diſſoluteneſs is likewiſe delivered in your Talmud, tit. de Synedrio, & de Ponderibus, &c. and by ſeveral of your rabbies. So that this excuſe of your Meſſiah delaying his coming, becauſe of your ſins, is

(*d*) Zech. xiii. 1. (*e*) Jer. iii. (*f*) Ibid. 15. (*g*) Ibid. 16.

againſt

againſt your own expoſitions and traditions, as well as not only without any ground from, but contrary to the tenure of the holy Scriptures; which I come next to ſhew yet more expreſsly.

3. The promiſes of the coming of the Meſſiah, are not only poſitive, and without any condition: but the caſe is expreſsly put of the ſins of David or of his poſterity; and there God declares (*h*), that though he will puniſh thoſe ſins, yet that becauſe of them, he would not break or alter the promiſe (*i*) he had given, concerning the coming of the Meſſiah.

4. But I have another anſwer yet to give, and I beſeech you ſeriouſly to conſider of it: that is, whether it would not be as great a puniſhment to your ſins, if God has blinded your eyes, that you ſhould not know your Meſſiah when he came; and a much greater puniſhment than if his coming had been delayed? And now conſider whether this be not the caſe. It has been plainly propheſied (*k*) that your builders would reject the chief Corner-ſtone. That he ſhould be (*l*) "for a ſtone of ſtumbling, and for a rock of offence to "both the houſes of Iſrael, for a gin, and for a ſnare to "the inhabitants of Jeruſalem: and that many among them "ſhould ſtumble, and fall, and be broken, and be ſnared, "and be taken —— (*m*) Stay yourſelves and wonder, cry "ye out, and cry: they are drunken, but not with wine; "they ſtagger, but not with ſtrong drink: for the Lord "hath poured out upon you the ſpirit of deep ſleep, and "hath cloſed your eyes: the prophets, and your rulers "the ſeers hath he covered; and the viſion of all is become "unto you, as the words of a book that is ſealed." Is not this literally your caſe? Are not your prophets now to you, as a book ſealed up? Do you underſtand by them, when you are to expect your Meſſiah? or what are the ſigns of his coming? No, they are all long ſince paſt; and you are left in the dark, in endleſs and groundleſs expectation.

(*h*) 2 Sam. vii. 14, 15, 16. (*i*) Pſal. lxxxix. 30, 33, to 37. (*k*) Ibid. cxviii. 22. (*l*) Iſaiah viii. 14, 15. (*m*) Ibid. xxix. 9, 10, 11.

And in this method there is no breach of God's promiſes, and yet his judgments have their full ſcope, and there is ſtill room and hopes of his mercy. When his time comes to open your eyes, then will you return to him, and he will turn to you. But even unto this day, when Moſes is read, the veil covers his face from you, *i. e.* the true import, and full end of the law; which veil is done away in Chriſt. "For Chriſt is the end of the law for righteouſneſs to every "one that believeth."

5. To avoid all the abſurdities of this pretence of yours, ſome of you have ſet up another notion, *viz.* that the Meſſiah did come at the time foretold by the prophets, and has been in the world ever ſince, and is ſtill; but, for your ſins, conceals himſelf among the lazers or lepers, that ſit at the gates of Rome, or elſewhere; others ſay * that he is in Paradiſe, but there fettered in a woman's hair. This we muſt ſuppoſe is by way of alluſion to Sampſon and Delilah. Some of the rabbies put a myſtical ſenſe upon this, meaning by the woman's hair, in which the Meſſiah is tied, your evil concupiſcence, which retards his coming.

How horribly abſurd and ridiculous is this? Theſe ſort of ſtrained excuſes were enough to convert any men of reaſon amongſt you. Beſides that they are contradictory, which ſhews one muſt be falſe. For the former pretence overthrows this; and this, if true, deſtroys that. But what foundation have you for this?

What prophecies have you for ſuch a ſtate of the Meſſiah?

What, was the end of his coming to keep himſelf concealed for one thouſand ſix hundred years? And all that time to undergo ſo miſerable and wretched a life, as you would have him?

How was his coming to be a light to the Gentiles ſo often propheſied of, if the Gentiles had not heard of him from that time to this?

If he has undergone the ſtate of a leper and a beggar now for above one thouſand ſeven hundred years; how do you

* Theodor. Hackſpan. *ubi ſupra.* p. 351.

object

object the afflictions and low eſtate of Jeſus for thirty-three years, as inconſiſtent with the glorious ſtate of the Meſſiah?

But if he be come, and you know him not; and that this, you think, will ſolve all thoſe propheſies concerning the time of his coming: behold your own conjecture truly fulfilled. He is come, and you have not known him; while the Gentiles have been convinced by his miracles, and ſubmitted to him, even to the uttermoſt parts of the earth, as was expreſsly propheſied of him.

Again, if you did not know him, what hinders but that you might likewiſe perſecute him? And why ſhould this ſeem a thing ſo impoſſible to you? Have ye not done the ſame to almoſt all of your own prophets? You ſtoned Zechariah (*n*) in the "court of the houſe of the Lord:" you perſecuted Jeremiah (*o*), till the day that Jeruſalem was taken; and the hands of your prieſts and your prophets were chief in the purſuit of his blood, and after them the "cry of all the people;" as it was in your perſecution of your Meſſiah. How often did you rebel againſt Moſes, againſt David, againſt Solomon, againſt all your prophets? How do all they complain againſt you? (*p*) "Moreover all "the chief of the prieſts, and the people, tranſgreſſed very "much, after all the abominations of the heathen; and "polluted the houſe of the Lord, which he had hallowed "in Jeruſalem: and the Lord God of their fathers ſent to "them by his meſſengers—But they mocked the meſſengers "of God and deſpiſed his words, and miſuſed his pro-"phets, until the wrath of the Lord aroſe againſt his people, "till there was no remedy." And now it has riſen a hundred fold more, ſince your deſpiſing and miſuſing of your Meſſiah. And your not knowing your Meſſiah was a juſt judgment upon you for your rejecting and perſecuting all your former prophets. Elijah (*q*) complained that you had ſlain them all, every one of the prophets, but himſelf alone; and he was forced to fly for his life, and was miraculouſly preſerved. In the ſolemn confeſſion (*r*) of the prieſts and

(*n*) 2 Chron. xxiv. 21. (*o*) Jer. xxvi. 8, 9. (*p*) 2 Chron. xxxvi. 14, 15, 16. (*q*) 1 Kings xix. 10. (*r*) Neh. ix. 26.

the

the Levites, and the covenant which they and the princes ſealed; they confeſs that they "ſlew the prophets who teſti-"fied againſt them, to turn them to the Lord." This Branch was never forgot in all their confeſſion, for it was notorious; (*s*) "We have not hearkened unto thy ſervants "the prophets, which ſpake in thy name, to our kings, our "princes, and our fathers, and to all the people of the "land." Why then ſhould it be thought a thing impoſſible with you, that you ſhould not hearken unto the laſt prophet, the Meſſiah, who refuſed to hearken to any before him? Read all your provocations recorded Pſalm cvi. and then your preſent obſtinacy will not appear ſo ſtrange to you, or ſo totally diſproportionable to your former demeanor. It is ſaid, ver. 7, "Our fathers underſtood not thy wonders "in Egypt." Then it is poſſible that you might not underſtand the wonders of your Meſſiah.

Your forefathers killed the prophets; and your fathers built their ſepulchres: and you ſay, (*t*) "If we had been "in the days of our fathers, we would not have been "partakers with them in the blood of the prophets: where-"fore ye be witneſſes unto yourſelves, that ye are the "children of them who killed the prophets." And how have you "filled up the meaſures of your fathers!" As our Meſſiah told you before-hand that you would do. That he would ſend you prophets and apoſtles: and that you would, ſlay and perſecute them: "that the blood of all the pro-"phets, which was ſhed from the foundation of the world, "might be required of your generation." And how ſeverely has it been required? Believe in this our Meſſiah to have been a true prophet; and that this laſt ſin of your crucifying him, and perſecuting his apoſtles and meſſengers, whom he ſent unto you, has been greater, as it has been more grievouſly puniſhed than all your former provocations: of which that you may be more ſenſible (for it is a material conſideration) I invite you, as the laſt thing I ſhall ſay upon this head, to make the compariſon betwixt your former captivities and ſufferings, and that much more heavy hand of God which has lain upon you ſince your crucifying of your Meſſiah.

(*s*) Dan. ix. 6. (*t*) Matt. xxiii. 29, 30, 31, 32.

6. In

6. In the book of Judges (*a*) you are told of the ſeveral captivities into which you were ſold for your repeated idolatries: firſt, into the hand of the king of Meſopotamia for eight years; then, ſecondly, after forty years deliverance, unto the king of Moab for eighteen years: thirdly, unto Jabin, king of Canaan, for twenty years: fourthly, into the hand of Midian, for ſeven years: fifthly, of the Philiſtines and Ammonites, for eighteen years: ſixthly, of the Philiſtines for forty years. The ſeventh was the great and longeſt captivity of ſeventy years in Babylon. All theſe for your idolatry. But, after this, you were cured of your idolatry, and to this day have kept yourſelves in the greateſt abhorrence of it; and yet now, ſince your rejecting of our Meſſiah, and ſaying, "Let his blood be upon us and our "children," you have undergone not a bare captivity, as in Babylon, where you were all together, and prophets ſent amongſt you to comfort you, and aſſure you of a reſtoration, and that in ſeventy years, but a diſperſion over the face of the whole earth, without a king, without any prophet, as a people forſaken of God, and without a temple or ſacrifice; and that not only for ſeventy or ſeven hundred, but now almoſt ſeventeen hundred years.

And if this heavy judgment be come upon you for your not underſtanding the promiſes of God, and thereby hardening yourſelves againſt the clear proofs which your Meſſiah brought of his miſſion, then is there no appearance of your being delivered, till you ſhall repent of this greater ſin, and more grievouſly puniſhed than your idolatries, to reject and crucify your Meſſiah.

The ingenious and learned Jew * before-mentioned anſwers to this, that the captivity of the ten tribes has been longer than that of the two tribes: and it cannot be ſaid that the captivity or diſperſion of the ten tribes was for the rejecting of their Meſſiah; and therefore that it cannot be concluded that the leſſer puniſhment of the two tribes was

(*a*) Judges iii. 8, 13, 14. v. iv. 3. vi. 1. x. 8. xiii. 1.

* Limbor. p. 99.

for

for a more heinous ſin (viz. of crucifying their Meſſiah) than that ſin, viz. of idolatry) for which, principally, the ten tribes were delivered to captivity.

Anſw. Though the ten tribes were ſent into captivity about a hundred and twenty years before the two tribes, yet their captivity has not been ſo long: for as the temporal puniſhment of any man ends with his death, ſo the puniſhment of a nation, as a nation, ceaſes, when that nation has loſt its name, and is ſcattered or incorporated into other nations. Particular perſons who have deſcended of that nation may ſuffer, but the nation is no more, and ſo cannot be ſaid to ſuffer when it is extinct. As when a regiment is broke, it is no more a regiment, though the ſoldiers are incorporated into other regiments. Thus in families, a family is ſaid to be extinct when the name is loſt, and there are none left to ſupport it, though all the particular perſons of that family may live under other names, and in other families. And thus it is that the family of the ten tribes of Iſrael are long ſince loſt in the world, all the Jews now known being of the family of Judah, as diſtinct from Iſrael; but the family of Judah, conſiſting of the tribes of Judah and Benjamin, with the Levites, are ſtill preſerved to ſuffer, a viſible example of God's juſt judgment and indignation againſt them; the very names of all the other tribes of Iſrael being ſo far loſt, as that not one of them is now known, or any Jew does ſo much as pretend to be of any of thoſe tribes.

Though it is very probable that many of the ten tribes are incorporated (albeit they may not know it) into the two remaining tribes, yet all go under the name of the two tribes; and therefore the two tribes are they only who are ſaid to ſuffer, as they only (and ſuch of the ten tribes as were then incorporated with them) were concerned in the rejection and crucifying of their Meſſiah (*x*).

But as the puniſhment of the two tribes has been ſo many hundred years continued longer than that of the ten tribes

(*x*) Lam. iv. 6.

for

for this their greater ſin of crucifying their Meſſiah, ſo there was a plain and viſible reaſon for the at firſt greater puniſhment of the ten tribes. 1. They rebelled from under the houſe of David. 2. They fell into ſchiſm againſt the houſe of Aaron, and ſet up new prieſts of their own. 3. As a conſequence of both theſe, they ſet up a falſe worſhip in the caves of Dan and Bethel, and returned not from their idolatry, their ſchiſm, and rebellion, till their extirpation.

And we may ſee a very legible hand of God upon them, in great judgments all along from their revolt.

Judah had many bad kings, but ſome eminently good.

Iſrael had a ſucceſſion only of nineteen kings from their defection, among whom there was not one that was good.

And they were carried away captive a hundred and twenty years before the captivity of Judah.

But then the captivity of Judah having been continued ſo much longer than theirs, (as before has been ſaid) ſwells up the puniſhment of Judah now to exceed theirs, as their ſin in crucifying their Meſſiah has far exceeded all the ſins of the houſe of Iſrael.

Let me add to this, the many and miſerable maſſacres and deſtructions of the two tribes ſince our Saviour, under the ſeveral falſe Meſſiahs whom they ſet up: in one of which they ſuffered more than in either of the deſtructions of Jeruſalem, by the Chaldeans, or the Romans, as before has been ſhewn from their own confeſſions.

Now let us conſider that at the day of judgment there is no repreſentation of nations, but every man ſuffers for his own ſin. National judgments are only in this world.

And hence it is obſervable that no wicked nation has ever yet eſcaped a national judgment in this world. Though God may bear long with them, yet, if they do not repent by a national ſorrow and amendment, judgment overtakes them even here; for no where elſe are there any national, either mercies or judgments.

And as all nations have been wicked in their ſeveral degrees, ſo have they every one been ſeverally puniſhed according to their demerits, even before the ſons of men.

But there are no judgments that have befallen any nation ſo legible as what have been ſent upon your nation, particularly upon the two tribes. No nation, ſince the earth began, has been kept under ſo long a captivity and diſperſion; ſo wonderfully preſerved, and ſo remarkably puniſhed! Preſerved for puniſhment! And, when God's time ſhall come for a glorious reſtoration in the acknowledgment of your only true and divine Meſſiah, O that this were the time!

But the learned Jew * has another anſwer, viz. that the Jews have not been free from idolatry ſince their return from the captivity of Babylon, nor are at this day; and therefore that the compariſon muſt fail which we draw betwixt the puniſhments that have come upon them for their former idolatries, and this ſixteen hundred years diſperſion, after they had forſaken their idolatry, which, he ſays, they have not yet forſaken. He ſays † that they have it in the utmoſt abomination, and avoid it wherever they can; but that for fear, or other baſe motives, very many of them have turned Mahometans in all the dominions of the Turk, in Africa, in Aſia, in Perſia and Arabia. But though this be an apoſtaſy, and forſaking of their law, yet he does not charge it as idolatry, becauſe the Mahometans do not worſhip God by images: but then he returns upon the Chriſtians, and ſays, that ſince the idolatry of the church of Rome, multitudes of the Jews have, to avoid perſecution, embraced the Popiſh idolatry in divers countries: and even in our own times (ſays he) we have freſh experiences of it. He names the whole Neapolitan ſynagogue of Barcelona, and all the others in Catalonia, who turned to the church of Rome. And in Spain and Portugal they have turned ſo faſt, that he ſays, *Ex Judæis apoſtatis fere omnes, & principes, nobiles, & populares, originem ducunt. Quod in iis regionibus adeo notum, ut nemo dubitaverit:* i. e. that almoſt all of them, princes, nobles, and commons, are ſprung from apoſtate Jews; which is ſo well known in thoſe countries, as that none doubt of it: notwithſtanding (as he ſays) for the ob-

* Limbor. p. 191. n. lv. † Ibid. p. 192.

taining

taining of great places and honours, especially ecclesiastical, they are obliged to renounce Judaism, and to bring certificates that they are not descended of the Jews; which (as we may easily believe him) are attainable at that, as well as other courts, where money is not wanting. This, indeed, does plainly shew the suspicion, at least, that they are descended of the Jewish race. He says, moreover, that many of their clergy, bishops, and even of the inquisitors themselves, are Jews in their hearts, and dissemble Christianity for the avoiding of persecution, and to gain honours and preferments, of whom (he says) some do repent and fly, as they can; and that there are in Spain both bishops, and the gravest of their monks, whose parents, brothers, and sisters, do fly into this country (that is, into Holland) that they may freely profess Judaism. That many of the Friars, Augustines, Franciscans, Jesuits, Dominicans, have there, and in several other countries, renounced their idolatry, i. e. of the church of Rome. This, I suppose, he would make an argument of their returning back to Judaism; but he does not deny that there are many Christian countries who have thrown off the idolatry of the church of Rome, and yet do not Judaize. But now, to consider all this whole excuse:

1. If many Jews, to avoid persecution, submit to idolatrous practices, as this learned Jew confesses, that he himself had often bowed the knee to Baal, for which he begs God's pardon, yet this is still but the defection of particular persons, and cannot be compared to those national idolatries, wherein their kings, and priests, and people did concur, of their own choice, without any force or compulsion; as were their many idolatries before the captivity of Babylon, and none the like since. Their principles were then corrupted, but not since; for they confess that they have idolatry in the greatest abhorrence, though many of them cannot resist unto martyrdom.

2. But this learned Jew has afforded us a very material consideration; for if all Spain and Portugal, or the greatest part of them, and likewise many in other countries, are descended of the stock of the Jews, this may lead us into conjecture

jecture what is become of the ten tribes. It is certain they are diſperſed among other nations; and though they have loſt their name, and conſequently their nation, yet their poſterity muſt remain ſomewhere, under other denominations. It is reaſonable to believe that many of them did return to Judæa, after the two tribes were reſtored to their country, and Jeruſalem and their temple were built again; and, conſequently, are mixed among them to this day. It will not be ſo eaſy, without this, to reconcile the vaſt numbers of the Jews that were deſtroyed in the ſiege of Jeruſalem, under their ſeveral falſe Meſſiahs, and that are now diſperſed all over the world. From whence I make theſe inferences:

1. That many of the ten tribes might be involved in the guilt of crucifying their Meſſiah, and ſtanding out againſt him unto this day, though all going then under the name of Judah, or the two tribes; and, conſequently, ſharing with them in the puniſhment.

2. If the Spaniards, Portugueſe, and other Chriſtians, or of the race of the Jews, they muſt be of the ten tribes; ſo far, at leaſt, as they were mixed with the two tribes; and they turned more into other nations than the two tribes, becauſe they have loſt their name and nation, which only ſurvives in the two tribes. Therefore the ten tribes may be ſaid to be more converted to Chriſtianity than the two tribes, who only, by name, of all the tribes, perſiſt in their infidelity againſt Chriſt our Lord.

This will make the puniſhment of the ten tribes, for their idolatry, ſchiſm, and rebellion, much leſs than that of the two tribes for the rejecting and crucifying of their Meſſiah, and this ſin of the two tribes to be much greater than that of their own former idolatries, as the puniſhment of it has been many ways more remarkably tranſcendent: which, I pray God, you may lay to heart as you ought.

3. (*y*) Many myriads of the Jews, as well prieſts as others, were converted to Chriſtianity in the beginning of

(*y*) Acts xxi. 20. vi. 7.

the

the Goſpel, upon conviction of what they themſelves had ſeen and heard: about three thouſand at one ſermon; five thouſand at another; (z) multitudes both of men and women. Theſe, with their religion, loſt (in time) their nation, or the name of Jews, having embraced that of Chriſtians in the ſtead of it; and their poſterity are Chriſtians, though of the Jewiſh race.

Now, by reaſonable computation, there are more of theſe Chriſtian Jews at this day in the world, than of all that are known by the name of Jews.

For the Jews were almoſt all cut off, and utterly extinct, in the deſtruction of Jeruſalem by Titus, and more afterwards by Adrian, for the adhering to their falſe Meſſiah Barcoſbas. And all that now go by the name of Jews, are ſprung from the ſmall remainders that were left out of theſe deſtructions, like brands plucked out of the fire.

Whereas the Chriſtian Jews eſcaped all theſe, and all that came upon the other Jews, for their ſeveral falſe Meſſiahs before-mentioned: and which is wonderfully obſervable, the Chriſtian Jews that were in Jeruſalem when it was beſieged, were ſaved by a miraculous providence, the ſiege being unaccountably raiſed for a ſhort time, till the Chriſtian Jews, taking hold of that warning of our Saviour, Matth. xxiv. 16. fled to Pella, a city in the mountains, and thereby eſcaped that dreadful overthrow which ſwept away the unbelieving Jews that waited their fate in Jeruſalem. By this it appears that the ſtock of the Chriſtian Jews has increaſed and ſpread much farther than that of the infidel Jews, whoſe tree was twice cut down by Titus and Adrian even to the ground, and left to ſpring again out of the old root; beſides the many great loppings afterwards, under ſeveral others of their falſe Meſſiahs. Whereas the believing Jews have increaſed and multiplied without any of theſe interruptions, and ſpread far and wide through the world. From whence we muſt conclude, that much the greateſt number of the Jews are converted, and have embraced the Chriſtian faith,

(z) Acts ii. 41. iv. 4. v. 14.

and by this means are delivered from that ſervitude and diſperſion which now lies only as a curſe upon thoſe infidel Jews who continue in their obſtinacy againſt the Meſſiah.

Let me here take notice of another paſſage in the place before quoted of Limborch, where that learned Jew, ſpeaking of the defection of ſo many of the Jews to idolatry, to Mahometiſm, &c. according to the countries where they live, wiſhes the Jews were as good as this argument of the Chriſtians would ſuppoſe them, viz. that they had reformed from their idolatry ſince their return from the captivity of Babylon, and were in other reſpects better than before, excepting that ſin of rejecting their Meſſiah, and perſiſting in it, which this learned Jew will by no means allow; but, to avoid the force of this argument, he makes the Jews now more wicked than ever. Upon which occaſion I would mind you of your expoſition (before-mentioned) of the fifty-third of Iſaiah, which makes them moſt holy and righteous, (ſee p. 69) and that their diſperſion was for the converſion of the Gentiles by them; whereas now you make them grow more and more wicked, and that they are corrupted every where with the idolatries and deluſions of the nations, inſtead of converting them.

Theodore Hackſpan, in his book before quoted, p. 394, cites the Jewiſh rabbies and Talmud making the ancient Jews much better than the modern. He quotes Jalkut upon the firſt of Iſaiah, and upon theſe words, that righteouſneſs lodged in Jeruſalem. R. Juda, F. R. Simonis, ſays, "That there was not a man to be found in Jeruſalem in whoſe hands any ſin was to be found. But how was this? The daily morning ſacrifice did cleanſe the ſins of the night, and the daily evening ſacrifice the ſins of each day; ſo that none was to be found in Jeruſalem upon whom there was any ſin." Thus he. But of the Jews, after the daily ſacrifice did ceaſe, it is ſaid in the Talmud by Jochanan Maſſech Joma. cap. 1. that a nail of the former Jews was better than the whole body of the after Jews. Becauſe the daily ſacrifice was wanting by which the former Jews were cleanſed.

See how vile the modern Jews are here made ever ſince the deſtruction of the ſecond Temple! How vile this learned Jew here makes them! And this, that they might find an excuſe for the delay of the Meſſiah thus long after the time foretold by the prophets.

But at another turn, when they apply what is ſaid of the ſufferings of the Meſſiah in the fifty-third of Iſaiah to their own preſent ſuffering ſtate, then they are the righteous ſervants of the Lord, and there is no deceit in their lips! Then do they apply to themſelves all that righteouſneſs which is there ſpoken of the Meſſiah. At one time they are more vile than the Heathen among whom they are mixed; at another time they are righteous above all that are on the earth, and by their righteouſneſs the Gentiles are to be converted.

Theſe contradictory pretences, ſet up ſeverally as they are pinched, ſhew the deſperateneſs of their cauſe. Therefore I will labour this point no further, but proceed to another topic.

VIII. It is ſtrange that you will adhere ſo obſtinately to the letter of thoſe promiſes made to Levi, which yet you muſt acknowledge are, (according to the letter) and have been long broken, and yet ſo eaſily get over the letter of the promiſes concerning the Meſſiah; which can never be fulfilled but in the perſon of Jeſus Chriſt.

Eſpecially conſidering that in that famous prophecy of the Meſſiah, Pſal. cx. it is expreſsly ſaid that he ſhould be a prieſt, not of the order of Levi, but of Melchizedec. Here was a new prieſthood; and a change of the prieſthood does neceſſarily infer a change alſo of the law. In your ſenſe of the promiſes to Levi, you make that promiſe of the future prieſthood after another order, to be a contradiction to the promiſes made to Levi; but in our ſenſe they both ſtand together, and the one fulfils and compleats the other. If you will admit no change of the Levitical prieſthood, you muſt throw off the Pſalms of David, as well as the Goſpel of Chriſt. Then conſider, that the promiſe to the prieſthood, of which David then propheſied, was confirmed by an oath, that God would not alter his purpoſe; "I have

" ſworn, and will not repent." There was no oath to the prieſthood of Levi. Again, the prieſthood of the Meſſiah was declared to be eternal; thou art a prieſt for ever: and the type of this prieſthood in Melchizedec was more noble than that in Levi, becauſe Abraham, the father of Levi, and of all Iſrael, did pay an acknowledgment to the prieſthood of Melchizedec, as ſuperior to his own, in paying of tythes to Melchizedec, inſtead of receiving tythes from him; and being bleſſed by Melchizedec, as his ſuperior.

When the flowing in of the Gentiles to the church is deſcribed, it is written, (*a*) " I will take of them for prieſts " and for Levites, ſaith the Lord:" or, if this were to be underſtood of the Jews, yet the covenant with Levi would be at an end, if the prieſthood were enlarged to let in thoſe of other tribes. And it is promiſed, (*b*) " Ye ſhall be to " me a kingdom of prieſts." This could not be under the Moſaical diſpenſation, but it is under the evangelical, where the prieſthood, which is deſigned to ſerve the whole earth, is not, it cannot be confined to one family, or tribe, or nation: and ſo the whole kingdom of God, which is the whole world, as they that are made capable of the covenant of grace, ſo alſo of the prieſthood.

And if the whole Gentile world were gathered unto you, (as you expect) then ſurely one tribe of Levi would not be ſufficient for prieſts to them all. So that according to your own expectation, there muſt be a change: and yet,

IX. Your great objection is, that God cannot alter any thing that he has once ordained. It is true God is immutable, and cannot change; and what he ordains, muſt anſwer the ends for which he has ordained it. He does not always tell us what thoſe ends are, and therefore we cannot always tell when they are accompliſhed; but when he pleaſes to make known to us the ends for which he has ordained ſuch things, what it is they tend to, and when they are to be accompliſhed, then when they are accompliſhed at the time he has named, to think this any breach of promiſe, or alte-

(*a*) Iſaiah lxvi. 21. (*b*) Exod. xix. 6.

ration

ration in God, which is the higheſt proof of his veracity and unchangeableneſs, is a great weakneſs in our underſtandings, and our great unhappineſs, when this betrays us to oppoſe and fight againſt the counſel of God, and forfeit our ſhare in his glorious diſpenſations, all ordained to bring us to bliſs.

1. This objection of yours, which keeps you from Chriſtianity, is that which has divided the Samaritans from you. They ſtick to the inſtitutions given to the fathers, to Abraham, Iſaac, and Jacob, and think that what was after commanded to Moſes, cannot alter what God had before appointed. "Our fathers worſhipped in this mountain," (ſaid a woman of Samaria (*c*) to our Meſſiah) "and ye ſay that "in Jeruſalem is the place where men ought to worſhip." Our Lord determined the caſe on your ſide againſt the Samaritans, and ſaid that ſalvation is of the Jews; but by the ſame argument that you can defend yourſelves againſt the Samaritans, you muſt yield up the cauſe to the Chriſtians: for if God could alter his inſtitutions from what he gave to the fathers, to what he commanded by Moſes, why not from what he commanded by Moſes, to what he inſtituted by Chriſt.

2. If you ſay that the argument will run on to all changes, as from what he inſtituted to Chriſt, to what it is pretended he a-new revealed to Mahomet, and ſo on to the end of the world, and then nothing can be certain,

I anſwer, that Mahomet could not prove his pretended revelations by thoſe marks as Moſes and Chriſt did; and they only, as ſhewn in the firſt part of this diſcourſe. And we may ſafely venture all the impoſtors in the world to counterfeit theſe marks, and to believe them, if they can.

But in the next place, Chriſt was foretold by Moſes, Deut. xviii. 18. Yea, and all prophets that follow after, as many as have ſpoken, have likewiſe foretold of theſe days in which our Meſſiah came into the world, and fulfilled all that they had propheſied of him. So that the Goſpel is a

(*c*) John iv. 20.

confirmation and fulfilling of the Law, and bears witneſs to it.

But though the alcoran does acknowledge both the Scriptures of the Old and New Teſtament, and ſo far bears witneſs to them, yet it cannot ſhew that Mahomet was foretold either by Moſes or Chriſt, or by any of the prophets. Nay, Chriſt has told that he is the laſt, and none to come after him; and therefore gives us caution to believe none ſuch. So that the Alcoran is in direct oppoſition both to the Law and the Goſpel.

If Moſes had ſaid that he himſelf was the laſt that God would ſend, then could not you expect any Meſſiah to come: but ſince Moſes has told us of a prophet (*d*) that God would ſend after him, and commanded all to hear him, and threatens God's judgments upon thoſe who will not hearken to the words of God which he ſhall tell them, what difficulty ſhould you make to hearken unto him who has come with the ſame atteſtation and ſeal of God as Moſes himſelf did?

3. If you ſay that you are forbidden, Deut. xiii. to truſt even miracles againſt what Moſes commanded, that Scripture ſhall be conſidered by and bye; and it will be ſhewn, that it extends only to the worſhip of falſe gods; and that they are not true, but ſeeming miracles, that are there ſpoke of.

But your Talmud (tit. de Synedrio) gives this as a ſtanding rule, that any command whatſoever may without ſcruple be tranſgreſſed by the command of a prophet; that is, who works miracles to atteſt his miſſion.

This is to be underſtood of thoſe commands which ſtand only upon poſitive precepts of God's inſtitution, and have not a moral, which is an indiſpenſible obligation in their own nature.

And of this there are many examples in Scripture, even where no miracles were wrought to warrant them; but they gave place oft-times to caſes of neceſſity and public good.

(*d*) Deut. xviii. 19.

How

How oft have the treaſures of the Temple, which were hallowed, being dedicated to God, and the very gold upon the doors and pillars of the Temple being given to Heathen and idolatrous kings (when other treaſure there was none) to procure peace to the kingdom upon great emergencies? And no cenſure paſt upon this.

David, in a caſe of neceſſity, eat of the hallowed bread (*e*), and thoſe who were with him, of which it was not lawful for any but the prieſts to eat, and was blameleſs.

The command of the ſabbath was tranſgreſſed as oft as the eighth day, for the circumciſion of a child fell upon that day.

Joſhua, and all the men of war (*f*), compaſſed Jericho on the ſabbath day.

Circumciſion (*g*) (ſo poſitively commanded) was omitted forty years in the wilderneſs.

Samuel (*h*) ſacrificed at Mizpeh, and built an altar at Ramah, neither of which was the place that God had appointed: which was contrary to the general command, Deut. xii. 13, 14. And beſides, Samuel was no Levite, and therefore it was death for him to offer ſacrifice, by Numb. xviii. 7.

The ſame did Elijah (*i*), (who was not a Levite) and had God's approbation by a great miracle then ſhewn.

The place of which Moſes ſpoke, Deut. xii. 5, 6, that God would chooſe to put his name there, was eſtabliſhed at Shiloh, which bore the name of the Meſſiah, and was called the tabernacle which God had pitched among men, Pſalm lxxviii. 60. It remained there from the days of Joſhua to Samuel, about four hundred and fifty years; and thither they brought their tythes, ſacrifices, &c. and came up yearly to worſhip, as Moſes had commanded, to the houſe of the Lord, which was there (*k*).

Yet this was altered by the authority of David and Solomon, who ſet it up at Jeruſalem; and moreover, made

(*e*) 1 Sam. xxi. (*f*) Joſh. vi. (*g*) Ibid. vi. 5. (*h*) 1 Sam. vii. 7, 17. (*i*) 1 Kings xviii. 38. (*k*) 2 Sam. i. 3, 7.

ſeveral changes in the courſes of the prieſts and the Levites, and other parts of the worſhip of God, which Moſes had commanded, particularly as to the time of the Levites ſervice (*l*), which, by the commandment of Moſes, was from the age of thirty to fifty. But this, by the laſt words of David (*m*), was altered, and they were to begin their ſervice at the age of twenty. And the reaſon is there given, becauſe the manner of their ſervice was changed, not being ſo laborious as when they were to carry the tabernacle upon their ſhoulders; the practice of which ceaſed, when the houſe of the Lord was built at Shiloh, after the conqueſt of Canaan, for then the ark (*n*) was fixed; and all the tribes repaired to it at Shiloh, and it was not carried about with them from place to place as formerly. Yet this alteration of the age of the Levites ſervice was not made till the time of David, but ſerved ever after. Ezra iii. 8.

And there was no prophecy going before to warrant theſe changes, nor had Moſes ſpoke any thing of them.

But he ſpoke expreſsly of the Meſſiah, and implied changes to be made by him; for he gives ſtrict charge (*o*) to hearken to what he ſhould command, and threatens God's judgments to thoſe who ſhould refuſe. Now what occaſion was there for this, if he had no more in commiſſion than Moſes had, and were to command nothing more or leſs than Moſes had done? If he were only to reinforce what Moſes commanded, that was the buſineſs of leſſer prophets, and would make him leſs than Moſes, which I ſuppoſe none of you will ſay.

But beſide Moſes, we have the joint voice of all the prophets, which do in expreſs terms declare, that the Meſſiah would make great changes from what Moſes commanded, and introduce a much more glorious ſtate into the church; which Iſaiah expreſſes (*p*) by new heavens and a new earth; and tells that at that time God would throw off the Jews, and make others his choſen: "And ye" (ſays God to your nation) "ſhall leave your name for a curſe to my choſen;

(*l*) Numb. iv. 3, 23. (*m*) 1 Chron. xxiii. 27. (*n*) Joſhua xviii. 1. 1 Sam. i. 7. iv. 3. (*o*) Deut. xviii. 15, 18, 19. (*p*) Iſaiah lxv. 17. lxvi. 22. lxv. 15.

"for

" for the Lord ſhall ſlay thee, and call his ſervants by ano-
" ther name." And, (*q*) " In thoſe days, ſaith the Lord,
" they ſhall ſay no more, the ark of the covenant of the
" Lord; neither ſhall it come to mind, neither ſhall they
" remember it, neither ſhall they viſit it, neither ſhall that
" be done any more." (*r*) " Behold the days come, ſaith
" the Lord, that I will make a new covenant with the
" houſe of Iſrael, and with the houſe of Judah; not ac-
" cording to the covenant that I made with their fathers, in
" the day that I took them by the hand to bring them out
" of the land of Egypt." (*s*)

And it is told that the Meſſiah ſhould be a prieſt, but not of the order of Levi, as before ſhewn, p. 69. And as your prieſthood, ſo it is ſaid that God would reject and put an end to your ſacrifices, and bring in their place the great and only expiatory ſacrifice of the Meſſiah. (*t*) " Sacrifice and
" offering thou didſt not deſire; burnt-offering and ſin-
" offering haſt thou not required:" What then? " A body
" haſt thou prepared me," (ſays the Meſſiah) " and lo I
" come to do thy will, O God: in the volume of the book
" it is ſo written of me."

Thus it is written of the Meſſiah, and of the changes which he was to introduce: yet you will have none of them becauſe they are changes, though you make no ſcruple of the changes by David, Solomon, and others, of which there were no prophecies; nor did they atteſt their miſſion, as our Meſſiah has done, by ſuch a multitude of miracles, and of ſuch a wonderful nature, as never before were ſhewn upon the earth.

Nay, you yourſelves have made alterations, without the command of any prophet that you can produce, or of any miracles to warrant you. For you are commanded (*u*) not to add to what Moſes commanded, as well as not to diminiſh. Yet how many traditions of your elders do you obſerve that were never commanded by Moſes? as the waſhing

(*q*) Jer. iii. 16. (*r*) Jer. xxxi. 31, 32. (*s*) See Ezek. xvi. 61, Not by thy covenant. (*t*) Pſal. xl. 6, 7. (*u*) Deut. iv. 2, v. 32. xii. 32.

of

of pots and cups (*x*), &c. If that were all, for you have traditions quite contrary to the laws of God, and which render them of none effect, Moſes ſaid, Honour (that is, ſupport) your father and mother: but ye ſay, if a man has made a voluntary corban, or gift of what he has, though in reverſion to the Temple, or other uſe of your law, he is free from that part of the fifth command, which you have thus enervated by your tradition. And many other ſuch like things do ye: nay, you have laid an eternal fund of traditions to vie with the written law: theſe you ſuppoſe delivered to Moſes, and by him orally conveyed to your elders, of which they have the keeping, and their ſtock is inexhauſtible. And theſe you make of equal authority with the written law.

What prophet or miracle had you for changing of the poſture in eating the paſſover ſo poſitively commanded, Exod. xii. 11? Yet after you were at reſt in Canaan, you made your own conſtruction upon the equity of the command, and releaſed yourſelves from the trouble of that manner of eating it.

You likewiſe added a *poſt-cœnium* to it, which you obſerved with as much ſtrictneſs as the paſſover itſelf.

You added baptiſm to circumciſion; and ſeveral other things which were not commanded in your law.

Yet you reject your Meſſiah, becauſe you ſay, he made alterations in the ordinances which Moſes delivered.

X. From what has been ſaid, I hope it will not be a difficult taſk to remove from you all ſcruple as to that maſter objection which you moſt inſiſt upon, grounded upon the xiii. of Deut. ver. 1, 2, 3, where it is ſaid, "If there ariſe "among you a prophet, or a dreamer of dreams, and giveth "thee a ſign or a wonder, and the ſign or the wonder come "to paſs, whereof he ſpake unto thee, ſaying, Let us go "after other gods, (which thou haſt not known) and let us "ſerve them: thou ſhalt not hearken unto the words of "that prophet, or that dreamer of dreams; for the Lord

(*x*) Joſhua i. 7. Prov. xxx. 6.

"your

" your God proveth you, to know whether you love the " Lord your God with all your heart and with all your " ſoul." From hence you would infer, that you are not to believe our Meſſiah, let his miracles be never ſo great, becauſe he ſeeks to turn you after other gods.

Anſw. 1. The ſign or wonder here mentioned, is not any true and real miracle; but only telling of ſomething which might afterwards come to paſs. And this has happened, and may happen many times by chance, which yet may ſeem a wonder to the people, and it is only againſt theſe falſe and ſeeming miracles that God here guards his people; which he ſometimes permits for the trial of their faith. Therefore obſerve, the word miracle is not uſed here; only a ſign, a wonder, or a dream.

For none can work a true and real miracle but God. And it cannot without the higheſt blaſphemy be ſuppoſed, that God would work a miracle, on purpoſe to ſet his ſeal to a lye. If this were poſſible, it would deſtroy all revelation; for how could we know when it were true or falſe? Therefore where there can be no doubt as to the miracle, there can be no ſcruple as to the revelation, which that is brought to atteſt.

Now the miracles of our Jeſus were ſuch, as that there can be no manner of doubt concerning them. The moſt hardened Deiſt upon the face of the earth, if he allowed the matters of fact, would grant them to be true and real miracles. And you muſt either allow them to be ſuch, or throw off all thoſe of Moſes, which were neither ſo great nor ſo many.

This is the firſt anſwer I give, which concerns the nature of the ſign or wonder that is ſpoke of Deut. xiii. The next anſwer is concerning that thing for which ſuch a ſign, or wonder, or dream is produced; and that is, " to go and " ſerve other gods." And as to this, conſider;

II. What are theſe gods here ſpoke of? It is told, ver. 7. " Namely, the gods of the people which are round about " you, nigh unto thee, or far off from thee, from the one " end of the earth, even unto the other end of the earth;"

that

that is, all the gods of the heathen world; and againſt all theſe our Jeſus is as ſevere as your Moſes, and confirms this very text, and all that Moſes commanded againſt them. They are called devils over and over again, 1 Cor. x. 20, 21. And Chriſtianity, wherever it has come, has rooted out all the pagan idolatry, more than ever the law has done.

Obj. 1. If you ſay that our Jeſus would have men to worſhip himſelf. 1. That is, none of the gods mentioned in this place of Deuteronomy; for you will not ſay that any of the heathen did worſhip the Meſſiah. 2dly, You do not refuſe worſhip to the Meſſiah: David called him Lord, and ſaid of him (*y*), "Thy throne, O God, is for ever and "ever"—(*z*) And "God, even thy God, hath anointed "thee"—And ſays to the king's daughter, (that is, the church) "He is thy Lord, and worſhip thou him." And God calls him (*a*) his fellow or aſſociate; and commands all the kings of the earth to kiſs (that is, to worſhip) the Son (*b*) (for that was an act of worſhip.) And David ſpeaks of him (*c*) (which can be applied to Solomon, no otherwiſe than as he was a type of the Meſſiah) "They "ſhall fear thee as long as the ſun and moon endure, "throughout all generations"— (*d*) "He ſhall have domi-"nion from ſea to ſea, and unto the ends of the earth"— (*e*) "All kings ſhall worſhip or fall down before him; all "nations ſhall ſerve him"—"Prayer ſhall be made ever "unto him;" or, he ſhall ever be adored—"all the nations "of the earth ſhall be bleſſed in him, and all the heathen "ſhall praiſe him;" theſe are the very epithets given to the Meſſiah (*f*) (and can belong properly to no other) who is called the "deſire of all nations;" and that "in him all "the nations of the earth ſhould be bleſſed;" and "to him "ſhall the gathering of the Gentiles be:" which is to Chriſt our Jeſus, but was not to Solomon, unleſs in a very low ſenſe, as he was greatly famed for his wiſdom, which made

(*y*) Pſal. cx. 1. (*z*) Ibid. xlv. 6, 7, 11. (*a*) Zech. xiii. 7. Pſal. ii. 12. (*b*) Job xxxi. 27. (*c*) 1 Kings xix. 18. (*d*) Hoſ. xiii. 2. (*e*) Pſal. lxxii. 5, 8, 11, 15, 17. (*f*) Hag. xi. 17. Ibid. xi. 7. Gen. xii. 3. xviii. 18. xxii. 18. xlix. 10.

him

him much reſpected by many of the heathen; but they had no relation to him, or were gathered unto him as their King or their Saviour, as they are now to our Jeſus, whom Solomon did but faintly repreſent. And if you ſhould apply the worſhip before-mentioned to Solomon, then ſurely much more to the Meſſiah. So that the worſhip of him is eſtabliſhed in your own Scriptures, and comes no way within the prohibition of Deut. xiii. which reſpects only the worſhip of the heathen deities. Let me add here what your Talmud (tit. de Synedrio) ſays, that Jeſus is not the name of any idol, nor can be reckoned ſuch, when the Chriſtians do refer the honour they pay to him, to God the Creator of all. And (tit. Schebuoth and Sabboth) agrees with Rabbi Solomo, who upon Gen. xxii. 18. does acknowledge, that God might take upon him human nature, and thinks that he had done it for a time. And the Chaldee Paraphraſe (upon Hoſea i. 7. and other places) calls the Meſſiah the "Word of God," the ſame that our St. John calls him. (John i. 1, &c.) And your Talmud upon Taanith, ſays from Iſaiah xxv. 9. That at that time, God would be pointed at and ſhewn even with the finger.

The above-quoted Pſalms, which ſpeak of the worſhip of the Meſſiah, are owned to refer to the Meſſiah. The ſecond Pſalm by David Kimchi, Abraham Eſdra, R. Jonathan in Bereſith rabba, and that moſt learned rabbi Saadia; who owns the ſame of Pſalm cx. as the Chaldee Paraphraſe does of Pſalm xlv.

But there needs no atteſtations, for theſe Scriptures are expreſſed in ſuch a ſtrain as may indeed be accommodated, at an infinite diſtance, to tranſactions here below; but cannot be properly applied nor verified of any but the Meſſiah. And ſome are ſuch as can, in no way, be adapted to any other. What other did David call his Lord? What other claims the worſhip of all the kings upon the earth? Whoſe kingdom but his is without end? And extends to the "uttermoſt part of the earth?" All which, in the ſecond Pſalm, is given to the Son, but was not given to David. Neither was it given to David that his fleſh ſhould not ſee

corruption, as it is promiſed, Pſal. xvi. 9, 10. but was verified of none that ever entered the grave, except only of our Meſſiah.

Obj. 2. You urge our doctrine of the Holy Trinity, as inferring plurality of Gods: and ſo to be brought within the prohibition, Deut. xiii. But you cannot ſay that this is any of the gods of the heathen, who only are expreſſed in that command: when we profeſs to worſhip none other but that one only God, who ſpoke to your fathers in Horeb, out of the midſt of the fire; and we deteſt all thoughts of any other God. Our great Meſſiah taught us this to be the "firſt of all the commandments, that the Lord our God is "one Lord (*g*)." And all expoſitions of the bleſſed Trinity, or inferences from it, that do, in the leaſt interfere with this, we condemn as impious and heretical.

But whether this one moſt ſimple and uncompounded nature of God may not be communicated to three eternal perſons, without either confuſion of the perſons, or dividing of the ſubſtance, does, in no way, interfere with the unity of the nature, becauſe this very hypotheſis does ſuppoſe the unity of the nature, in the ſtricteſt ſenſe that is poſſible. And if we ſhould be under great difficulty (as how can it be otherwiſe) in explaining ſuch an unfathomable myſtery, yet can it not infer polytheiſm upon us, while we are ready to part with all, rather than to admit of that.

You know, we bring many proofs for this, out of your Scriptures of the Old Teſtament (ſome are named hereafter) and you cannot infer from hence, that we do not own theſe Scriptures (nay this is a proof that we do own them) only that we do not underſtand them right. And if you ſhould prove againſt us, that we do not rightly underſtand (who does?) the divine incomprehenſible nature, while we contend, as earneſtly as you, for the neceſſity of its unity, you cannot charge us with polytheiſm for our miſtake in other matters. And therefore this can never come under the prohibition of Deut. xiii.

(*g*) Mark xii. 29.

I ſay

I ſay not this, that I would wave entering with you upon this ſubject; but there is not room for it in this ſhort eſſay; it would require a diſcourſe by itſelf: all that I am at preſent concerned in, is to ſhew you, that this can be no cauſe for your rejecting our Meſſiah. There are ſome called Chriſtians, who ſay that we have miſtaken our Meſſiah in this point; but I would be loth to clear you from the objection by that method. Only thus much it ſhews you, that if we have miſtaken the Goſpel, ſo have we the law too, as to the doctrine of the Holy Trinity: and this can be no more an argument that we ſet up polytheiſm againſt the law, than againſt the Goſpel, which as ſtrongly aſſerts the unity of God as the law, and confirms all that the law ſays of it. Therefore if you reject the Goſpel, becauſe we would infer a Trinity from hence; you muſt, upon the ſame account, reject the law too. If our inferences are not juſt, the Goſpel is cleared as well as the law: and if our arguments do hold, then the law does infer a Trinity as well as the Goſpel.

Nor is it we Chriſtians alone that would infer a Trinity from your law, your own Cabaliſts do diſtinguiſh God into three lights; and ſome of them call them by the ſame names, as the Chriſtians, of the Father, the Word, and the Holy Spirit; and yet ſay, that this does not at all break the unity of God. Your famous Philo expreſſes the ſame in many places. Upon the ſacrifices of Cain and Abel, he ſays, That God was accompanied with his two ſupreme virtues of power and goodneſs: and that God being one, did produce, out of his clear mind, three operations, of which each is unmeaſureable or infinite; for that his powers are unlimitable. And in his ſecond book of the Huſbandry of Noah, he diſtinguiſhes theſe into τὸ ὄν, τὸ δεσποτικὸν τὴν ἴλεω δύναμιν; *i. e.* being, power, and goodneſs. In his Allegories, he calls the Word, the name of God, and the Maker of the world, or the great Inſtrument of God, whereby he made the world, the ſame as our Goſpel, John i. 3. And in his book before quoted of Huſbandry, he calls the Word by the ſame name as we do, Heb. i. 3. Χαραχλὴρ, the expreſs image of God. Moſes, the ſon of Nehemannus, calls him

him the Angel, the Redeemer, who is called the face of God, that is, ſays he, God himſelf, the ſame that appeared to Jacob at Bethel, and ſaid to Moſes in the buſh, "I am "the God of thy father," &c. the Lord that ſhould come to his temple; and the Angel of the covenant propheſied of. Mal. iii. 1.

Maimonides, in his book of Foundations, and after him Joſeph Albo, diſtinguiſh in God, 1. That which knows. 2. That which is known. 3. The knowledge itſelf.

But I will not detain you here with quotations: our Euſebius, in his book of the Preparation of the Goſpel, p. 327. tells you that all your rabbies, after the God of all and his firſt-born Wiſdom, do join in the ſame divine nature a third, whom they call the Holy Ghoſt, by whom your inſpired perſons were enlightened. And you do all generally agree, that this Holy Spirit, was not any thing that was created; and yet you diſtinguiſh it from him that ſent it. Your Rabbi —— tells us, that in the word Elohim, there are three degrees, each diſtinct by itſelf, yet all one; joined in one, yet not divided from one another.

And, as you make that Holy Spirit which inſpired the prophets, not to be a creature, yet diſtinct from him who ſent him: ſo you make what you call the Schechina to be a divine thing; and diſtinguiſh it not only from God, but from that Holy Spirit. As in your Jeruſalem Gemara, of Documents, c. 3. And the Babyloniſh Gemara, tit. Joma, c. 1. Your R. Jonathan, in the Preface Ecka Rabthi, ſays, that the Schechina waited three years and a half upon Mount Olivet, expecting the converſion of the Jews.

This was the place where (*h*) our Jeſus (the true Schechina) made his abode; and whence he rode into Jeruſalem to accompliſh his bleſſed paſſion. And the time of his preaching was about three years. So long, he ſaid (*i*), he would bear with the obſtinate Jews. This may be applied (*k*), as to what your high-prieſt ſaid, though himſelf knew not the true import of it.

(*h*) Luke xxi. 37. xix. 29. (*i*) Luke xiii. 7. (*k*) John xi. 51.

Now

Now then all theſe forecited teſtimonies to the Holy Trinity, whether of Jews or Chriſtians, are not the ſetting up of any other God, but only ſearching into the nature of that God whom we acknowledge: as to give an example (though any parallel to God muſt be at an infinite diſtance) we argue three great faculties in the ſoul, the underſtanding, the memory, and the will: and that theſe may be underſtood, without either confuſion of the faculties, or diviſion of the ſubſtance of the ſoul. And ſuppoſe that ſome ſhould object, that this was making of three ſouls: I ſay, that whatever the conſequence might be from this hypotheſis, yet that no man could be juſtly charged with holding three ſouls in man, who profeſſed that he held but one. We are not to be charged with the conſequence of an opinion, ſo as to infer that we do not hold that opinion; for we may not ſee all the conſequences of what we hold: therefore, though three faculties ſhould infer three ſouls, yet cannot he who holds three faculties, be charged with holding of three ſouls, while he does but hold one ſoul; and thinks that the contrary does not follow from his holding of three faculties in the ſame ſoul.

Thus, though three Preſons did infer three Gods: yet does not he hold three Gods, who holds three perſons in one and the ſelf ſame God.

If you ſay, that this will excuſe all idolatry, as of thoſe who worſhipped the ſun, &c. becauſe of God's ſuppoſed reſidence there; I anſwer, no; becauſe ſuppoſing of that reſidence, yet it would be idolatry to worſhip the ſun, or any thing elſe, merely becauſe of God's reſidence in it. As you would have thought it idolatry to have worſhipped the temple, or the cloud of glory, becauſe of God's ſpecial preſence, which was there afforded.

But they did not think it to be idolatry, was it therefore none? No, our thoughts cannot alter the nature of things. And there are ſins of ignorance. None ever confeſſed, no, nor, I believe, thought himſelf to be an idolater: for then, it muſt be ſuppoſed, that he would not continue in it. But he that adores one God in three perſons (ſuppoſing him

miſtaken in his judgment) comes not under either of the branches of idolatry. 1. Of a falſe object. 2. Of a falſe manner of worſhip. For the manner, there is no pretence; that conſiſts in the worſhip of God by images (which he has forbidden) whether artificial, of our own making, or natural, by any creature of God's making; as any of the hoſt of heaven, ſun, moon, or ſtars; or any thing here below, as of men, birds, beaſts, fiſh, &c. though the worſhip be referred to God, as repreſented by them; or from his ſuppoſed reſidence or preſence in them. This is idolatry in the manner of our worſhip. But nothing of this can be applied to the three Perſons, which are ſuppoſed to be God himſelf. This was your idolatry in the golden calf, which you did not take to be God himſelf, that you yourſelves had made; nor could ſuch folly be ſuppoſed in your Solomon, as to think the images he made to be that God that made him. This was the idolatry forbidden in the ſecond command.

Then, for the firſt command, which relates to the object of worſhip. If that be taken for ſetting up any creature as the Supreme Being; or giving divine honour to angels, or other miniſters of God, as inferior or middle deities, betwixt the Supreme Being and us, as the Heathens thought their dæmons, whom therefore they called *Dii Medioxumi:* in neither of theſe ſenſes can idolatry be applied to three Perſons ſuppoſed to be the Divine Nature. For 1ſt, They are not creatures, nor 2dly, any inferior deities, nor ſo ſuppoſed to be; but all equally to partake of the ſame one Divine Nature; as the three faculties do of the ſame one and indiviſible ſoul: and therefore whatever miſtake may be ſuppoſed in the hypotheſis, yet it cannot come under any notion of idolatry. And no otherwiſe can the worſhip, or paying of divine honour to the Son or Meſſiah (already proved) be excuſed from idolatry, than by acknowledging him to be the Word of God (as you yourſelves have called him) that is, one of the Divine Perſons in the Godhead. And this does avoid all notion of idolatry in the worſhip of him; and can no ways come under that prohibition of Deut. xiii. againſt worſhipping of the falſe gods of the Heathen. You lay

lay not this to the charge of your own Talmud and rabbies, who give the ſame expoſitions of your Scriptures as we do: and you know how many of them do think that a plurality of powers in the one nature of God is intimated in the very name of God, Elohim, which is the plural number; and in theſe texts, among others of the Old Teſtament. Gen. i. 1, 26. iii. 22. xix. 24. Pſal. xlv. 6. lxviii. 18. cx. 1. Iſaiah ix. 6. xlviii. 16. Jer. xxiii. 6. Mich. v. 2. Zech. ii. 8, 9. iii. 2. xii. 10. Now may we not reaſon upon theſe texts, as you have done, without imputation of polytheiſm? And ſo of the texts in the Goſpel? And when you come to embrace the Goſpel, (God ſend) we will reaſon with you, as with ſome amongſt ourſelves, upon what proofs are there, anſwerable to, and explanatory of thoſe texts in the Old Teſtament, which favour the doctrine of the Holy Trinity; and then, and not till then, will be the proper time to enter with you at large upon this controverſy.

But what I have now ſaid, I hope, will be ſufficient to remove all ſcruple from you againſt the Goſpel, from that text of Deut. xiii.

And then that other text, Deut. xviii. 19. will look very terribly upon you, that whoever ſhould not hearken to the Meſſiah, when he came, God would require it of him. And you feel it ſeverely, that God has required it.

3. But to put an end to this objection from Deut. xiii. the Jews have yielded it; if they will allow that learned Jew who diſputed with Limborch to give their true ſenſe: and that according to their own Talmud, before quoted, (tit. de Synedrio) which ſays, That any command may be tranſgreſſed, by the command of a prophet, *i. e.* who can work miracles to prove his miſſion.

And ſays that learned Jew *, If Chriſt, after he aroſe from the dead, had publicly ſaid to the whole congregation of Iſrael, Hear, O Iſrael, I am the Lord thy God, who brought thee out of the land of Egypt: and now have redeemed you from a greater captivity of ſin; whom you

* Limbor. Collat. p. 132.

have ſacrilegiouſly put to death. *Abs dubio* (ſays he) without doubt, all Iſrael had believed, even to this preſent day. Nor had there been room left for any doubt, or ſuſpicion. Thus he; and he thereby yields, that ſuch a miracle as this would have convinced all the Jews to believe Chriſt, when he called himſelf God. And therefore he muſt grant, that, notwithſtanding of what is ſaid, Deut. xiii. miracles are ſufficient to vouch even the divinity of Chriſt; and then the diſpute muſt only lie upon the miracles recorded in the Goſpel. For the truth of which, I refer to what is ſaid in the firſt part againſt the Deiſts.

XI. I would in this place call upon you to reflect, how very exact and particular God has been in fulfilling all the promiſes he has made unto your nation. One eſpecially, which does confound the Deiſts, who call for ocular demonſtration, and have it, to their aſtoniſhment, in ſeeing at this day the fulfilling of a moſt wonderful prophecy and promiſe made to your nation, ſo many ages paſt.

The Deiſts have made you, of all people, their reproach, becauſe you have been called the peculiar people, the holy nation, choſen of God before all nations upon the earth. Yet ye were the "feweſt of all people (*l*)." And they called you the moſt inconſiderable and contemptible: and thence argue (in their bold and prophane manner) the injuſtice and nonſenſe of God's preferring theſe to all the great nations and monarchies upon the earth.

They will not believe that God had more regard to the Jews than to any other people; or gave any prophecies concerning you. They ſay you coined thoſe prophecies after the facts they ſpake of. But they demand the fulfilling of a prophecy, which they may ſee; and this that I ſpeak of is obvious to the eyes of all the world; it is recorded Jer. xlvi. 28. "Fear thou not, O Jacob my ſervant, ſaith the "Lord, for I am with thee, for I will make a full end of "all the nations whither I have driven thee, but I will not "make a full end of thee, but correct thee in meaſure, "yet will I not utterly cut thee off." You will find the

(*l*) Deut. vii. 7.

ſame,

ſame, chap. xxx. 11. and chap. xxxi. 36, 37. it is written, "If thoſe ordinances depart from before me, ſaith the "Lord, then the ſeed of Iſrael alſo ſhall ceaſe from being "a nation before me for ever. Thus ſaith the Lord, if "heaven above can be meaſured, and the foundations of the "earth ſearched out beneath, I will alſo cut off all the ſeed "of Iſrael, for all that they have done, ſaith the Lord." See the ſame repeated, chap. xxxiii. 24, 25, 26. and confirmed, Iſaiah xxvii. 7. xxix. 7, 8. liv. 9, 10. lxv. 8. Ezek. vi. 8. xi. 16. xii. 15, 16. Amos ix. 8, 9. Zech. x. 9. And this was purſuant to what was promiſed in the law. Lev. xxvi. 44. Deut. iv. 31, &c.

Now let us ſee how literally this is fulfilled at this day. The great and famous monarchies, who, in their turns, governed the world, and ſucceſſively had deſtroyed the Jews (the Aſſyrian, the Babylonian, and the Roman) are all vaniſhed, as a dream; there is not one of them left: their very names are loſt in the earth. But your nation, though "ſifted among all nations (as your prophet Amos expreſſes "it, in the place above quoted) like as corn is ſifted in a "ſieve," yet are you preſerved a viſible diſtinct people, in all the nations whither you have been ſcattered. And the rage of many kings and governments have been let looſe againſt you, to root you off from the face of the earth: and you had no helper. Yet the Lord was your helper, and put it out of the power of all the earth (though without any viſible oppoſition) to infringe the promiſe he had made to you.

The Deiſts dare not ſay, that theſe prophecies were made yeſterday, or not before the fall of theſe monarchies; eſpecially of the Roman, the greateſt of them. And what a folly, as well as vanity had it been in the Jews, to have forged ſuch audacious and provoking prophecies, to have thus dared all the powers of the earth to extirpate them, who hated them, and had them perfectly at mercy?

And here let the Deiſts take notice of this wonderful inſtance, freſh before their eyes, of God's particular regard to this moſt deſpiſed and contemptible people (in their ac-

count) above all the other nations of the earth, how great and honourable ſoever. This is a ſtanding miracle exhibited to the whole world.

Yet is there no partiality in this, as the Deiſts weakly reaſon: for as Moſes was a type of the Meſſiah, ſo the church of the Jews was of the Chriſtian, whoſe pales are enlarged to take in the Gentiles, as often promiſed in your prophets: by which means your nation was indeed a type of the whole world (repreſented in the long garment of the high-prieſt, Wiſd. xviii. 24. Iſrael called the "firſt-fruits "of God's increaſe." Jer. ii. 3.) And conſequently the bleſſings of which the Jews partook, the promiſes made to them, and miraculous protection over them, was taking poſſeſſion in the name, and ſecuring the reverſion of the Gentile world, in the ſame glorious inheritance. And it was indifferent as to the good of the world, which nation had been pitched upon as their type. But God choſe the leaſt, that his power and protection over his church might be more viſible; and to ſhew that ſhe muſt ſtruggle through many difficulties and temptations; yet never be extinct (though often diſtreſſed) when all the powers and glory of this world ſhall vaniſh as ſmoke before the wind.

Moreover, if God had choſen any of the great and powerful nations of the earth for his peculiar people, to whom if he had given his promiſe to continue them for ever, the ſcorners would have blaſphemed, and ſaid that God was ſtill on the ſtrongeſt ſide: and they would have aſcribed their preſervation to their own power and greatneſs. This is the reaſon God gives, why he choſe the "feweſt of all "people (*m*)," leſt they ſhould ſay it was through their own power and might that they were preſerved. Beſides, the peculiar nation being (as before has been ſaid) a type of the Chriſtian church, it was neceſſary that the odds, as to the world, ſhould be againſt that nation; which ſhould ſubſiſt not by worldly ſtrength and politics, but by ſignal and miraculous providences. Thus the church was beſt repre-

(*m*) Deut. vii. 7. viii. 17.

ſented,

ſented, as greatly DISTREESSED, but wonderfully PRESERVED!

And here, O ye Jews, behold an equal promiſe of our Meſſiah to his church, and as miraculouſly fulfilled, as that before-mentioned to yours. He promiſed, as before quoted, that his church ſhould continue "even unto the end of the "world;" that he would be all that time with her to preſerve her, and that the gates of hell ſhould never prevail againſt her. And when was this promiſed? Even at the beginning, when his religion was low and contemptible, hardly yet known in the world. And the devil has been let looſe (as againſt Job) to ſpare only her life; all things elſe have been put in his power. All the rage and madneſs of kings and ſtates, and mobs have been exerted againſt her to deſtroy her, for many ages together; and ſhe was deſtitute of all human help; nay it was made unlawful for her to help herſelf, or take arms in her own defence, againſt her perſecuting kings, as it was not permitted to you, though an army of 600,000 men (*n*) harneſſed, beſides a great mixed multitude, againſt Pharaoh, Ahaſuerus, &c. But ſhe was commanded, as you, only to "ſtand ſtill, and "ſee the ſalvation of God;" yet ſtill ſhe inſiſted upon the promiſe of her preſervation made to her by her Meſſiah; nay more, of her victory at laſt over all theſe her enemies; and boaſted of it before them, while they were worrying of her without controul; and told them, that it was not in their power to deſtroy her. Yet all this notwithſtanding, how miraculouſly did our Jeſus perform his promiſe, in his now almoſt one thouſand ſeven hundred years preſerving and ſupporting her under all her perſecutions, and giving her victory and triumph! And ſhe ſtill truſts in that promiſe, that it can never fail. Could any power leſs than divine have foretold this preſervation, and have effected it for ſo long a time without human means, without ſword or policy? This is not the leaſt of the miracles which God has ſhewn, as to you, ſo to us, in theſe promiſes ſo full of wonder, ſo

(*n*) Exod. xii. 37, 38. xiii. 18. xiv. 13, 14.

viſibly fulfilled, and now every day fulfilling. And this is not a mean argument to join you to us, when you ſee the ſame God working ſo wonderfully for you and us, for us only of all the whole earth; none of whom can boaſt ſuch promiſes, and ſuch performances, ſo unconteſtably true, and ſo truly miraculous. Therefore I beſeech you to hearken at laſt to the wiſe reaſoning of your own Gamaliel, leſt ye be found (*o*) "fighters againſt God." For if this work had not been of God, it could not have ſo ſtood. You firſt ſpent your rage againſt this Stone, which your builders refuſed, and as he foretold you, it has grinded you to powder (*p*). Will you not yet confeſs, that "this is the Lord's doing," and that it is "marvellous in your eyes!"

And now, O ye people greatly beloved, and grievouſly puniſhed, did your God ever fail you in any promiſe that ever he made to you? You are, and have been many centuries, preſerved only upon the Almighty Power that there is in his promiſe, too ſtrong for all the armed legions of earth and hell, which have overthrown mighty empires, and every thing elſe but you, and his church repreſented by you. Believe it, your preſervation ſince your return from Babylon, has been greater than in it, in Egypt, or in the wilderneſs. And can you imagine that he who has wrought ſo many miracles, and ſtill continues them, leſt any of his works ſhould fall to the ground; can you think that his great promiſe of the Meſſiah, and the time of his coming, ſo particularly deſcribed, is come to nought? As to the time, you confeſs it has failed, if not fulfilled in our Jeſus. And where the time (as of your ſeventy years captivity, 2 Chron. xxxvi. 21. Jer. xxix. 10.) is named, there it is impoſſible that there ſhould be a failure as to the time.

See how exactly your deliverance out of Egypt (*q*) was fulfilled, even to a day of the promiſe (*r*) made to you. And your forty years in the wilderneſs, to the forty days of your ſpying out the land. Nor did your many and repeated

(*o*) Acts v. 38, 39. (*p*) Matt. xxi. 42, 44. (*q*) Exod. xii. 40, 41. (*r*) Num. xiv. 34.

provocations

provocations all along that time, put off God's promiſe one day further. See then and conſider, how punctually our Meſſiah's coming was according to the ſtated times and ages prefixed, as it is ſet down in the firſt chapter of our Goſpel according to St. Matthew, ver. 17. The generations from Abraham to David fourteen generations; from David to the captivity fourteen generations; and from the captivity to Chriſt fourteen generations. God's fixed and determinate times are not to be altered.

The time and place of the Meſſiah's coming, as foretold in the prophets, is one of the ſureſt marks by which we muſt know him. To that end they were ſo particularly ſet down: and if theſe fail, ſo may all the reſt.

How do you expect to know your Meſſiah when he does come? He cannot vouch himſelf from the time of his coming foretold by the prophets, for that is paſt, and there is no other time prefixed.

Will he prove his miſſion by miracles? And will he ſhew greater than our Jeſus has done? Can he fulfil the prophecies of the Meſſiah, by not coming at the time they have named, ſo much as our Meſſiah, by fulfilling all the circumſtances of the prophecies, as to time, place, &c.?

XII. Born of a virgin (*s*), of the ſeed of (*t*) David, in the town of (*u*) Bethlehem, within four hundred and ninety (*x*) years of the building of the ſecond temple; before the ſcepter had quite departed from (*y*) Judah; to whom the gathering of the Gentiles has been, as to their Meſſiah, as well as the Meſſiah of the Jews. This is an aſtoniſhing mark, and notorious, and inſiſted upon over and over again in the (*z*) prophets; and of which none that ever took upon them to be the Meſſiah, except only our Jeſus, had the leaſt ſhadow of a pretence. And conſequential to this, that he ſhould make the (*a*) Heathen nations forſake their idolatry, and deſtroy their idols. No nation of the Heathens was

(*s*) Iſaiah vii. 14. (*t*) Ibid. xi. 10. (*u*) Mich. v. 2. (*x*) Dan. ix. 25. (*y*) Gen. xlix. 10. (*z*) Pſal. ii. 8. lxxii. 8, 11, 17. cx. 2. Iſaiah ii. 2. xi. 10. xlix. 6. li. 15. lv. 5. lx. 3. lxv. 1. Zech. ix. 10. Hoſ. ii. 23. (*a*) Iſaiah ii. 18, 20. xxxi. 7. Ezek. xxx. 13. Zech. xiii. 1, 2.

ever

ever brought to this by the Law, but how many have by the Goſpel! By the way, you may ſee by this how unreaſonable your exception is againſt our Meſſiah from Deut. xiii. as if he introduced the worſhip of the Heathen deities, which he only has effectually deſtroyed. He only ſtopped the mouths of their oracles, which within a hundred years after his coming, were all totally ſilenced in the reign of Trajan. He only depoſited his (*b*) fleſh in the grave, in hope that it ſhould not ſee corruption. They gave him (*c*) gall to eat, and vinegar to drink. They (*d*) pierced his hands and his feet, and caſt lots upon his veſture. They upbraided him in the ſame (*e*) words foretold. His very (*f*) price was foretold, and how the money ſhould be diſpoſed of. That a (*g*) bone of him ſhould not be broken. Again, the particular manner (*h*) of his riding into Jeruſalem upon an aſs, which your moſt learned Rabbi Saabia expounds of the Meſſiah; as alſo the ii. and cx. Pſalm, and other Scriptures before quoted. I could enlarge upon this head, and ſhew many more particulars wherein our Jeſus did, and does, exactly anſwer to the ſeveral marks given of the Meſſiah by the prophets.

Which is ſo ſtrong an argument, ſo paſt all poſſibility of cheat or contrivance, that the firſt of our Apoſtles reckoned it even beyond miracles, or rather as the greateſt of miracles, greater than thoſe ſhewn to our outward eyes. For proving the miſſion of Jeſus, from their being eye-witneſſes of his majeſty in his miraculous transfiguration, and the voice which then came to him from the excellent glory: (*i*) "Which voice" (ſays he) "we heard when we were "with him in the holy mount." He adds as a yet further proof, "We have a more ſure word of PROPHECY, "whereunto ye do well that ye take heed, as unto a light "that ſhineth in a dark place, until the day dawn, and the

(*b* Pſal. xvi. 9, 10. (*c*) Ibid. lxix. 21. (*d*) Ibid. xxii. 16, 18. (*e*) Matth. xxvii. 43. (*f*) Zech. xi. 13. Matth. xxvii. 6, 7. (*g*) Exod. xii. 46. John xix. 36. (*h*) Zech. ix. 5. (*i*) 2 Pet. i. 16, 17, 18, 19.

" day-ſtar ariſe in your hearts." Pray God it may; and that he may open your underſtanding, as he did of his Apoſtles (*k*), that they might underſtand the Scriptures, that thus it is written, and that " thus it behoved Chriſt to " ſuffer, and to riſe from the dead the third day:" and that " repentance and remiſſion of ſins ſhould be preached in " his name among all nations, beginning at Jeruſalem." All which you ſee fulfilled, yet you will not believe it! You ſee all fulfilled that he foretold ſo particularly of the deſtruction of Jeruſalem; and that that age in which he ſpoke ſhould not paſs till it was fulfilled, though there was no appearance of it (*l*).

XIII. What witchcraft then is it, what heavy judgment lies upon you, that you ſhould harden your hearts againſt this Meſſiah, in expectation of another, in whom the prophecies of the Meſſiah can never meet? For the time is already paſt, as you yourſelves confeſs, againſt this Meſſiah, who ſhed his blood for you; who died praying for you; who offered up himſelf a ſacrifice to purchaſe eternal redemption for you; which the blood of bulls and goats could never do. The very inſtitution of ſacrifices does declare, that God would require ſatisfaction for the ſins of men; and that without ſhedding of blood there cou'd be no remiſſion; not of blood leſs noble than our own, but of the great Meſſiah, of dignity and merit ſufficient to make ſatisfaction for the ſins of the whole world. And now I appeal to yourſelves, whether this ſcheme of God, in Chriſt, reconciling to himſelf lapſed humanity, and thus triumphing over all the powers and malice of that ſerpent the devil, who ſeduced man into diſobedience, be not more worthy of God; a demonſtration of greater power, and wiſdom, and goodneſs, and a more literal fulfilling of that firſt promiſe of the Meſſiah, Gen. iii. 15, than giving to any one nation (though it were your own) the conqueſt over your enemies, and a temporal reign upon earth.

(*k*) Luke xxiv. 49. (*l*) See Ezek. xxi. 10, 13. vul. The ſword that deſtroyed Jeruſalem, called the ſcepter of God's Son.

Yet

Yet this is the objection you have againſt your ſecond Moſes, as againſt the firſt (*m*); Where is the inheritance of fields and vineyards that was promiſed to us? You hanker after theſe poor periſhing things, and neglect your eternal inheritance, which was figured by them. You long more after an earthly than a heavenly Canaan; and for a little reſt there, than a reſt for ever. Therefore you reject our ſpiritual, and chooſe to yourſelves an earthly and fighting Meſſiah. But you cannot have him; and God, in mercy, has turned you out of your beloved Canaan, and given it the baſeſt of men, to take off your minds from it, and to inſtruct you, that that is not the end of his promiſe. And becauſe you prefer it to the glorious purchaſe that our Meſſiah has made for us, which the angels deſire to look into; but ye think ſcorn of that pleaſant land where there is everlaſting victory, and triumph, and ſabbath, and jubilee! O ſhut not your eyes wilfully againſt your own happineſs. Call it to mind, and ſhew yourſelves men. Is not this a more exalted and rational completion and archetype of your law, than the tables for municipal ſtatutes, to diſtinguiſh you of ſome ſhort time from other people? If that be all the import (as you would have it) of the whole glorious diſpenſation to Moſes, was this worth or proportionable to that aſtoniſhing appearance upon Mount Sinai, and all that wonderful œconomy of miracles by which your Law was eſtabliſhed! But if you will look (with us) to the end of your Law, then you will ſee every tittle and iota of your Law fulfilled, exalted, glorified in the heavenly reign of our Meſſiah, the ſecond Adam; the innocent Iſaac that was ſacrificed; the Joſeph that was ſold by his brethren, for their future preſervation; the Moſes who delivers us out of Egypt, the ſlavery and thraldom of ſin and hell, and conducts us ſafe through the wilderneſs, the temptations and diſtreſſes of this wretched life; our Joſhua, who opens our way into the heavenly Canaan, through faith in whoſe bleſſed paſſion and ſacrifice for us, when lifted up upon the

(*m*) Numb. xvi. 14.

croſs,

croſs, like the brazen ſerpent in the wilderneſs, the mortal biting of our ſpiritual ſerpent the devil is cured, and our ſouls eternally ſaved. Theſe are the glorious things that were ſhewn to Moſes in the mount, after which pattern (*n*) he was commanded to frame the tabernacle, and all the inſtitutions thereof, as types and ſhadows of thoſe things which were to be perfected in the heavens, by faith in which the juſt ſhall live (*o*). And will you now reject the pattern for the types? Will you degrade your Law, to mean nothing beyond the outward ſenſes? Nothing but what is viſible and temporary? To have no ſpiritual and eternal ſignification? Do we therefore make void the Law? Yea, we eſtabliſh the Law. We carry it whither it was intended: we ſhew an eternal and heavenly light ſhining through it all, and every inſtitution of it: we look with reverence and great veneration upon it, as the ſchool-maſter that was ordained to bring us unto Chriſt, as the ladder that was ſet to climb up into heaven. But you will not climb with us; you ſay that the top does not reach to heaven, therefore you ſtop ſhort upon the lower ſteps. The patriarchal diſpenſation before the flood was one ſtep; the Abrahamical another; the Moſaical another; and you ſtill expect another, the laſt, and moſt perfect under the Meſſiah. Yet you reject it now it is come, and there is to be no other.

Be not afraid to loſe your Law or your prophets, you will hear them read every day in our churches, and their true and full import explained and fulfilled in the Goſpel. For the Goſpel is the beſt comment upon the Law, and the Law is the beſt expoſitor of the Goſpel. They are like a pair of indentures, they anſwer in every part: Their harmony is wonderful, and is, of itſelf, a conviction. No human contrivance could have reached it. There is a divine majeſty and foreſight in the anſwer of every ceremony and type to its completion; and there is one yet to be completed. O the glorious day when that ſhall come! That is, the grafting you in again to your own olive-tree, the fatneſs,

(*n*) Exod. xxv. 40. (*o*) Hab. ii. 4.

the

the ſweet, the marrow of your Law, fulfilled in the Meſſiah (*p*). For we do believe that "blindneſs is happened to "Iſrael but in part, till the fulneſs of the Gentiles be come "in, and ſo that all Iſrael ſhall be ſaved. For the gifts and "calling of God are without repentance. God hath conclu-"ded all; us firſt, and then you, in unbelief, that he might "have mercy upon all; that the praiſe may be to God, and "not to us, that no fleſh ſhould glory in his preſence. O "the depth of the riches both of the wiſdom and knowledge "of God! How unſearchable are his judgments, and his "ways paſt finding out! For of him, and through him, and "to himare all things. To whom be glory for ever. Amen."

XIV. But though the judgments of God are, in themſelves, unſearchable, yet they generally move in the road of ſecond cauſes: and ſo far it is lawful for us to look into them, and ſometimes neceſſary, in order to our duty, as being not only brought upon us for our ſins, but continued by them. So that by diſcovering the cauſes, we may prevent or ſhorten our judgments.

Therefore I would here enquire a little into ſome of thoſe moſt viſible cauſes which have all this time, and do ſtill harden the Jews in their obſtinacy againſt receiving the doctrine of Chriſt.

And ſome of theſe are on the Jews ſide, and ſome on the Chriſtian.

I. Firſt for the Jews. They have, ſince Chriſt came, quite altered their own doctrine and topics from whence they uſed to argue before, on purpoſe to avoid the plain proofs thence drawn for our Jeſus being the Meſſiah. To inſtance in a few:

1. There are great preſumptions that they have altered and corrupted the very text of their own Scriptures of the Old Teſtament in thoſe places which ſpeak of the Meſſiah, which gave the marks of him, and pointed out the time of his coming. However this they cannot deny, that whether by the loſs of the vowels in the Hebrew tongue, or from

(*p*) Rom. xi. 25, 26, &c.

whatever

whatever cauſe, that language is now rendered ſo uncertain, beyond any other in the world, as that one word bears many different ſignifications, inſomuch that every text almoſt will afford perpetual jangling; which has made ſome of your moſt learned Rabbies complain that your Scriptures are become, in the words of the prophet before quoted, as a book ſealed up to you; and that the true ſenſe of them will not be known till the coming of the Meſſiah, who will reſtore the vowels and right knowledge of the Hebrew tongue.

It is long ſince the Hebrew has ceaſed to be the vulgar language of your nation, and conſequently to be well underſtood by the Jews themſelves, who now learn it at ſchools, as other men do. Joſephus complains of the loſs of the Hebrew tongue among the Jews in his time, and it was ſo long before.

This occaſioned that the Greek tranſlation of the lxx. was publicly read in the Jewiſh ſynagogues, many years before the coming of Chriſt.

This tranſlation they thought to have been divinely inſpired, and made great boaſts of it, as you may read in Joſephus, and many other of your authors: and it continued in this reputation with you, and was read in your ſynagogues till Chriſt came, and for about an hundred years after. Then you rejected it, becauſe of the plain proofs that were brought out of it for our Jeſus being the Meſſiah, and ſet up the ſpurious Greek tranſlation of Aquila, who was an Heathen, a Chriſtian, and a Jew, which he then made when the Hebrew tongue was ſo greatly decayed from that purity which it confeſſedly retained when your lxx. prieſts made that famous tranſlation for Ptolemy, king of Egypt, about three hundred years before Chriſt: and was never queſtioned by any of you, but held in the higheſt veneration all that time, till after the coming of our Saviour, becauſe of the flagrant teſtimonies it bore to him. And were it now admitted, as it formerly was amongſt you, and as it is truly the beſt comment, at leaſt, upon the Hebrew text, to determine the ſenſe of it when the words are doubtful, and (becauſe of the preſent defect in that language) of various and different

different ſignifications, I ſay if this were admitted, (which you cannot refuſe, without caſting reproach upon all your predeceſſors for three hundred years before Chriſt, who did admit it; and upon yourſelves for ſo doing, and confeſſing that you have done it unreaſonably) you would not be able to maintain your hold againſt Chriſtianity. Are not the quotations of your Scriptures, which are in your learned Philo, (who lived in the days of Chriſt and his Apoſtles) and of others your chief rabbies before that time, more according to the tranſlation of the lxx. than of the Hebrew text, as you have it at preſent? And what reaſon can you give, why you dare not quote that tranſlation ſtill? But becauſe it renders the ſenſe of the Hebrew ſo, as leads it directly upon our Saviour, and cannot be extended further; and it cuts off thoſe vain and precarious excuſes which you would draw from the preſent uncertainty of the Hebrew text. Yet none of your latter expoſitions can pretend to any authority equal to that of the lxx. even yourſelves being the judges! This ſhews that you are not diſpoſed to find out the truth, but bent to ſhut the door againſt it.

2. As the Jews have thus manifeſtly ſtood out againſt the conviction of the holy Scriptures, by inventing and uſing theſe arts to corrupt them, at leaſt, to hide and obſcure their true meaning, ſo have they for the ſame reaſon, viz. in prejudice to our Meſſiah, altered their former principles and notions, which they had received by tradition from their fathers. Thus finding that the notion of the Λόγος, or word of God, which was univerſally received amongſt the Jews before Chriſt came, and largely inſiſted upon by Philo, that learned Jew, even in the Apoſtolical age, that, as before has been noted, he was God, and yet a diſtinct Perſon from God, the Father of all: that he was Χαρακτὴρ, the expreſs image of God: the great Δύναμις, inſtrument or power by which God made the worlds: the Ἀρχιερεὺς, ſupreme archetypal high-prieſt and mediator betwixt God and men, of whom the high-prieſt under the Law was a type and figure, by outward communion with whom men were made capable of, and had a title to the inward and ſpiritual communion with

with the λόγος, and by him of reconciliation and acceptance with God. From this notion of the λόγος, St. John diſputes, according to the received principles of that age; and having proved Chriſt to be the λόγος, he in his Goſpel, Epiſtle, and Revelation, gives him the titles which were uſually aſcribed to the λόγος, of light, and life, and truth; and from having communion with him, infers that we have alſo communion with the Father. But the Jews finding that theſe principles led directly to the divinity of our Saviour, and all that is ſaid of him in the Goſpel, preſently forſook their own principles; and as early as Juſtin Martyr, began to deny them, as Trypho the Jew did, and put Juſtin upon the proof of the λόγος, being a divine Perſon, &c. which he did out of Philo, and other approved authors of the Jews.

It is plain that the Jews thus underſtood it, when they accuſed our Saviour of blaſphemy (*q*), and of making himſelf God, becauſe he called himſelf the Son of God; for they called themſelves the Sons of God in a large ſenſe, as ſo adopted, and in fœderal covenant with God; but they knew it was the received notion among them, that the manner how the λόγος was the Son or word of God, was natural, as proceeding from the nature of God; and that for any to call himſelf the Son of God, in this ſenſe, was to make himſelf God: whence it is plain that they thought the λόγος to be God.

3. The Jews finding that the myſtical and primary ſenſe of their Law did refer to the Meſſiah, and were moſt exactly and particularly fulfilled and compleated in our Saviour, rather than be convinced by this, they have now (as the learned Jew that diſputed with * Limborch) denied that the Law was typical, or referred to any more perfect ſtate. The contrary of which is plainly intimated, Exod. xxv. 40. from whence our Apoſtle convincingly argues, Heb. viii. 5. But the Jews now will have no type in the Law, or the office of the Meſſiah to extend beyond temporal conqueſts,

(*q*) John x. 33, 36. * Limbor. p. 62. & alibi.

to any ſpiritual or heavenly acquiſitions, ſticking in the bare letter of the Law.

But Philo and the Jews before him, did largely inſiſt upon the myſtical, which they made the principal end and intendment of the Law: as indeed it is, and moſt apparently ſo, if we duly conſider the Law itſelf, and the prophets, who often mind us of it; and without which they cannot be verified; (as before is ſhewn) and their meaning runs low and contemptible, no way anſwering the magnificence and glories which are there revealed.

Jacob confeſſed himſelf (*r*) and his fathers to be ſtrangers and pilgrims on the earth. Whence our Apoſtle (*s*) does argue very forcibly, "That they who ſay ſuch things, declare "plainly, that they ſeek a country. And truly if they had "been mindful of that country from whence they came "out, they might have had opportunity to have returned: "but now they deſire a better country, that is, an hea-"venly." If the land of Canaan had been all their view, and they had underſtood the promiſe made to them of Canaan to have had no further meaning than the letter, only the temporal enjoyment of that pleaſant country, they needed not have wandered from it as they did, or they might have had opportunity to have returned to it.

When David (*t*) was in poſſeſſion, and king of it, he declared himſelf to be then in a pilgrimage, and a ſtranger in it.

This ſhews they had a further proſpect, and that they extended the promiſe made to them of Canaan, to mean principally and ultimately the heavenly Canaan, of which they underſtood the earthly Canaan only as a type. And if Canaan itſelf was a type, no doubt Jeruſalem muſt be ſo too, and the temple with all the ſervice of it, that all is your Law.

Your Cabala makes your outward Law but the cortex or ſhell of the hidden myſteries that are contained in it.

(*r*) Gen. xlvii. 9. (*s*) Heb. xi. 14, 15, 16. (*t*) 1 Chron. xxix. 15.

Yet you are now grown to that violent prejudice againſt this, (though you would ſtick to your Cabala too, and think it divinely inſpired) becauſe it leads directly upon Chriſtianity, that your learned Jew * has ſet up this principle, *Quod cultus externus, ut talis, eſt interno multo perfectior.* And as a juſt conſequence of this, *Quod externus non minus Deo gratus, quam internus*, i. e. "That the outward worſhip, as ſuch, is more perfect than the internal:" and therefore, "That the outward worſhip is not leſs grateful to God than the internal." Theſe are the titles of his chapters; and the end of ſetting up theſe deſperate poſitions is, to obviate the Chriſtian argument, that the inward and ſpiritual worſhip is chiefly regarded by God; and conſequently the inward and ſpiritual meaning of the Law is much preferable to the letter and outward obſervances: that therefore there is a ſpiritual ſenſe in the Law which exceeds the letter, or which is typified by it: that this is fulfilled in Chriſt, who has thereby conſummated and perfected the Law. To oppoſe this, the Jews are driven to that extremity as here you ſee, to prefer the outward worſhip, as ſuch, to the inward; contrary to the tenor of their own Law, and their prophets, where the inward circumciſion of the heart is ſo often inculcated and preferred to that outward in the fleſh. Nay, the outward inſtitutions of the Law, where the inward and ſpiritual meaning and intendment of them is not regarded, are declared to be hateful and abomination to God (*u*). The inward is not only preferred (*x*), I deſire mercy, and not ſacrifice, and the knowledge of God more than burnt-offerings (*y*); ſacrifice and offering thou didſt not deſire, but mine ears haſt thou opened (*z*): but in reſpect to the inward, the outward are ſaid not to have been commanded by God; that is, they were commanded for the ſake of the inward: and therefore without reſpect to the inward, the outward were not commanded.

* Limbor. Collat. N. xi.—xii. p. 118, 120. (*u*) Iſaiah i. 11 to 21. (*x*) Hoſ. vi. 6. (*y*) Pſal. xl. 9. (*z*) Jer. vii. 22, 23.

To rid you out of this perplexity, your learned Jew has advanced a ſtrange ſort of an argument to maintain his paradox before-mentioned, of preferring the outward, as ſuch, to the inward worſhip and ſenſe of the Law, where he explains his foreſaid poſition thus; that the outward is not to be ſuppoſed without the inward; and that the outward, as including the inward, is preferable to the inward. But this, inſtead of ſolving the caſe, makes no caſe at all of it. It is no more than this, whether two be not more than one? Whether both outward and inward be not more than the inward alone? Which nobody will diſpute with him. But then this cuts off all compariſon betwixt the outward and the inward, and conſequently makes no ſenſe of thoſe texts before-mentioned, and many others, where the ſame compariſon is inſiſted upon. And when the Jew ſays that the outward, as ſuch, is preferable, &c. what does he mean by *as ſuch?* Is it the outward, as outward? Which any one would take to be the meaning. But his meaning, as he explains it, is the outward, as ſuch, that is, as both outward and inward.

So very thin and contradictory are theſe ſtrained excuſes you have ſet up againſt the ſpiritual, which is the main and principal intendment of your Law, becauſe it cannot be fulfilled but only in our bleſſed Lord and Saviour Jeſus Chriſt, and his ſpiritual kingdom.

4. The modern Jews have, ſince Chriſt's time, gone away from the conſtant tradition of their fathers before Chriſt came, viz. that the Meſſiah would ſhew himſelf to the world, and vouch his commiſſion (*a*) by miracles, of which ſufficient has been ſaid before: and that this contrivance diſcovers plainly their guilt, that it is not conviction which they want, but that they are reſolved not to be convinced.

5. They have not only departed from the traditions of their fathers, but they have invented new and ſtrange conceits, of which their fathers, before Chriſt came, never

(*a*) John vii. 31.

dreamt.

dreamt. As of two Meſſiahs, the one a ſuffering, the other a triumphing Meſſiah, to anſwer theſe two ſtates of ſuffering and triumphing, which were told of the Meſſiah, and both fulfilled in our bleſſed Saviour; to avoid which, the Jews, ſince his time, have invented theſe two Meſſiahs. The Jews in our Saviour's time, even the Apoſtles themſelves, till after his reſurrection, had not the true notion of the ſufferings of the Meſſiah, much leſs of his death. When he ſpoke of it, his diſciples (*b*) rebuked him, and underſtood (*c*) nothing of it; and the Jews (*d*) told him, "We have heard "out of the Law, that Chriſt abideth for ever: and how "ſayeſt thou, the Son of man muſt be lift up?" that is, crucified. They were looking out then, as you are now, for a temporal fighting Meſſiah, who ſhould (*e*) reſtore again the kingdom to Iſrael. They thought not then (*f*) of the ſufferings of the Meſſiah; far leſs did they dream of two Meſſiahs, one to ſuffer, the other to conquer. You can ſhew no footſtep of any ſuch doctrine amongſt the Jews before Chriſt came; and it ſhews the diſtreſs your latter Rabbies were driven to, when they could find no ſhift but ſo groundleſs and fooliſh an invention; which is of a-piece with your other fulſome and ridiculous legends (before-mentioned) of the Meſſiah's ſitting theſe ſixteen hundred years amongſt the lepers at the gates of Rome: that he is in paradiſe, but tied in a woman's hair, that he cannot come. The mad and nonſenſical ſtories of your Behemoth and Leviathan: of God's weeping when your city was deſtroyed: of his daily ſtudy in the reading of your Law: and ſuch other delirious fancies as ſhew the greatneſs of your judgment, threatened 2 Theſſ. ii. 11. and viſibly fulfilled upon you more than upon any people, God ſending you ſtrong deluſion that you ſhould believe ſuch monſtrous, and even contradictory lies, becauſe you received not the truth, that ye might be ſaved, but had pleaſure in unrighteouſneſs, in ſuch rabbinical and ſhameleſs fopperies, they deſerved not

(*b*) Matth. xvi. 22. (*c*) Luke xviii. 34. (*d*) John xii. 34.
(*e*) Acts i. 6. (*f*) Luke xxiv. 26.

to be called forgeries, on purpoſe to elude the infallible demonſtrations which our Jeſus gave of his being the Meſſiah. Theſe are the great, though pitiful obſtacles, on the Jews ſide, which hinder their embracing of Chriſtianity.

II. I come now to other obſtacles which lie on the Chriſtian ſide.

1. The learned Jew* that diſputes with Limborch, complains of the great ſcandal given to the Jews in the popiſh countries by the idolatry which they ſee practiſed there. They cannot bear to ſee the great God painted like an old man in their churches and maſs-books, in their ſhops and houſes, and publicly ſold by allowance. This they take to be the ſin ſo ſtrictly prohibited, Deut. iv. 15, 16. and in many other Scriptures; beſides their worſhipping of ſaints, angels, &c. See Sandy's Speculum Europæ.

2. There is another ſtrange ſort of impediment which the Jews have met with in popiſh countries; that is, that if any of them turned Chriſtians, they forfeited all their eſtates, on pretence that they or their anceſtors had got them by uſury. Of this ſeveral good men in the church of Rome have complained; as Bradwardinus, l. 1. de Cauſa Dei, c. 1. Corall. part. 32. Cardinalis a Severina in Catechiſmo generali pro Catechum. c. 20. Gaſparus Belga, a Jeſuit, in Epiſt. Ormutina, (eſt inter Epiſtolas Judaicas) wrote anno 1549, ſpeaking of one rabbi Solomon, who deſired baptiſm, ſays, that he and many others would have embraced Chriſtianity, if it had not been for that Law amongſt the Chriſtians, that they ſhould be obliged to reſtore whatever they had got by uſury. This I have taken out of Hornbeck contra Judæos. Lugdun. Batav. anno 1655, in Prolegom. p. 31, where he cites more authorities; as of Joh. Gerſon apud Bochellum, tit. de Judæis. And amongſt us, Edwin Sandys, de ſtatu Relig. cap. 41. Georgius Theodorus, de ſtatu Judæorum in Republ. Chriſtian. cap. 9. He ſays, that this cuſtom was taken away by a particular bull of pope Paul III. by the council of Baſil. Seſſ. 19.; and of Lateran, under

* Limbor. Collat. p. 102.

Alexander

Alexander III. c. 26. How it is at this day at Rome, in Spain, Portugal, and other popiſh countries, I cannot tell; but Sir Edwin Sandys, in his book before quoted, wrote anno 1599, ſays, that when he was in Italy, the ſame forfeitures were ſtill exacted of the Jewiſh converts, except where the pope gave diſpenſations, which he knew granted only to ſome few phyſicians, their gains not being ſuppoſed as got by uſury, but it ſtopped the converſion of others.

II. I come now to the reformed churches, where the Jews meet with neither of theſe fore-mentioned impediments. But whether many of the Jews do come out of the popiſh countries, as the learned Jew confeſſes to Limborch, on purpoſe to avoid the idolatry of the church of Rome, to which many of them are forced to comply, to ſave their lives or eſtates; and others are tempted to it, and counterfeit Chriſtianity for the ſake of preferments, eſpecially in Spain and Portugal, as before has been told; and whence many of them do fly into Holland, where there is univerſal liberty of conſcience; and that they may profeſs and practiſe their judaiſm openly. This has brought ſo many of them into Holland, more than to other of the countries called reformed.

1. But there is another ſort of impediment which they meet with there, that is, the various ſects which are tolerated and owned as churches, though moſt oppoſite and contradictory to one another. This goes violently athwart the fixed and ſtated principle of the ſegullah or peculium, which God delivered to the Jews from the beginning, and implies the true notion of a church, as being a peculium, or ſelect ſociety, gathered from amongſt the reſt of mankind, under governors and laws, with promiſes and privileges of their own, peculiar to themſelves, and independent of all others upon the earth. Now the Jews cannot think this ſegullah transferred to a Chriſtian church, where there is no notion of any ſegullah at all, or ſuch a lame one, as admits and excludes nobody. A park without pales! which reduces the church from a ſociety to a ſect, only to believe ſuch things, without being ſubject to the governors or laws

of the ſociety, without a principle of unity. A church without a biſhop! a body without a head! this latitudinarian no-principle is ſo perfectly adverſe to the received notion of the Jews all along, that they can as eaſily believe no faith, as no church; and can never think their faith terminated or fulfilled in that church, whoſe conſtitution is not framed alike to theirs: for how otherwiſe was theirs a type of ours? A type is ſo called from its likeneſs to what it does repreſent. And what reſemblance is there betwixt the church in Jeruſalem, under one high-prieſt, and in Holland, where epiſcopacy, of which that was the image, is aboliſhed? What agreement betwixt the Temple, into which none were admitted but proſelytes to the conſtitution, as well as faith of the Jews; and that church, whoſe doors are open to all comers and goers, which has no communion, by admitting of all communions, and makes no communion neceſſary? How was the one altar of the Jewiſh church a type of altar againſt altar in every pariſh? Of a hundred oppoſite altars; that is, communions at Amſterdam, yet all acknowledged to belong to the Chriſtian church? It is true, oppoſite communions may agree in many things, as all do in ſome things: but how they can be called one church, is as difficult for a Jew to apprehend, as a church without a communion; that is, a ſociety which has no ſociety. A church, and not a peculium, is an open incloſure; and a ſociety without government is as great a contradiction; and other government than monarchical in the church the Jews never underſtood, nor did God ever appoint. Not that all churches in the world ſhould have one viſible and univerſal head upon earth, more than all the kingdoms of the earth are to have one univerſal monarch under God, to whom the whole world is one kingdom, though compoſed of many different and independent kingdoms: as the one catholic church may conſiſt of many independent churches, which all make one church to Chriſt. Of each of theſe under her own biſhop, the church of the Jews at Jeruſalem (being itſelf a particular church) was a type, under her high-prieſt. And as he was a type of Chriſt, the λόγος, the archetypal and

and univerſal high-prieſt and biſhop of the catholic church, ſo the church of the Jews may be called a type alſo of the univerſal church, as that nation was a type of the whole world, of which the high-prieſt wore a repreſentation as well of the ſegullah, as before has been obſerved from Wiſd. xviii. 24. For God is king of all the earth, though more eſpecially of his church.

The miraculous performance of that promiſe of perpetuity which God made to the nation of the Jews, has been diſcourſed before. But here I would take notice of one great means by which it has been brought to paſs; which is, the ſtrict notion that the Jews ſtill retain of the ſegullah. Thoſe many myriads of them who, at firſt, went over to Chriſtianity, found as ſtrict a notion of the ſegullah there; and ſaw how it was transferred, as from the beginning it was intended, from the ſegullah of Moſes to that of the Meſſiah. It was indeed but the ſame church, or ſegullah, under different œconomies, or diſpenſations; but thoſe whoſe eyes were blinded, that they ſaw not this, remained in their infidelity, and ſtuck to their old ſegullah; and God, who brings good out of evil, has made this a means, the great means, of keeping them a diſtinct people to this day. For ſhould the Jews turn ſo much latitudinarians, as to loſe this notion of the ſegullah, and grow indifferent in their rites and cuſtoms: if they ſhould intermarry with the nations, whither they are ſcattered, and conform to their cuſtoms and manners, they would ſoon loſe both their name and religion; and by being mixed with the reſt of the world, grow undiſtinguiſhed from them, as a river when it is emptied into the ocean.

If it be objected that then the aforeſaid promiſe of God would be broken, of preſerving them for ever a diſtinct people, and therefore that this promiſe ſtands in the way againſt their converſion,

I anſwer, that it did not ſtand in the way againſt their converſion in the beginning of Chriſtianity; for the Jews who then turned Chriſtians, did not at all, for that, loſe their

their name or nation. And they were plainly diſtinguiſhed from the converts of the Gentiles (*g*).

To make this more clearly underſtood, let us conſider, that when Chriſt firſt ſent forth his Apoſtles, their commiſſion was limited to Jews only, in the ſtricteſt ſenſe, (*h*) "go not into the way of the Gentiles, and into any "city of the Samaritans enter ye not. But go rather to "the loſt ſheep of the houſe of Iſrael." Here the Samaritans, though Jews, are excluded, becauſe they were ſchiſmatics, and not ſtrictly within the ſegullah. And thus it continued all Chriſt's life-time. The Goſpel went not without the pale of the ſegullah. After Chriſt's reſurrection, then he extended their commiſſion further, and bade them (*i*) "go, and preach among all nations," but ſtill beginning at Jeruſalem. To ſhew that there the Chriſtian ſegullah was firſt eſtabliſhed; and derived from thence, as from the root, to ſpread among all nations. But it appears not that the Apoſtles, even long after that time, underſtood the full extent of this their commiſſion: for, till the viſion of the ſheet, Acts x. Peter himſelf did not know that the Gentiles were capable of being admitted into the Chriſtian ſegullah: of which he was convinced by a great miracle then ſhewn in the deſcent of the Holy Ghoſt upon Cornelius, &c. which ſatisfied the reſt of the church who contended with him, for his preaching to the Gentiles, Acts xi. So that till this time, the Chriſtian ſegullah conſiſted of none but of the Jews only; into which the Gentile proſelytes were afterwards admitted, even as into the Jewiſh ſegullah under the law. Chriſt foretold the future calling of the Gentiles, (*k*) "Other ſheep have I which are not of this fold; them alſo "I muſt bring, and they ſhall hear my voice," ſaid Chriſt to the Jews. And ſignified to them, that the Gentile converts ſhould at laſt be made equal to them, and in ſome reſpects be preferred before them, in that parable of thoſe called at the eleventh hour (*l*). And that the firſt called

(*g*) Acts vi. 1. xxi. 25. (*h*) Matt. x. 5. (*i*) Luke xxiv. 47.
(*k*) John x. 16. (*l*) Matt. xx.

ſhould

ſhould be laſt, and the laſt firſt. He ſhewed, likewiſe that his mercy extended even to the Gentiles, by his compaſſion to the woman of Canaan. But at the ſame time, he aſſerted the prerogative of the ſegullah, or church of the Jews: whom he calls the children (*m*), in compariſon of whom the Gentiles were but dogs, that is, out of the ſegullah. (as it is expreſſed, Rev. xxii. 15.) "I am not ſent (ſaid "Chriſt to her) but to the loſt ſheep of the houſe of Iſrael;" that is, the ſegullah was to be ſet up only with them, to whom only he himſelf preached; the Gentiles were to come in only as proſelytes to the Jews; and that not by the miniſtry of Jeſus himſelf, but only of his Apoſtles, after his aſcenſion. In all things the preference was given to the Jews; and the Chriſtian ſegullah was firſt fixed among them; they are the natural branches (*n*); theirs is Chriſt, the Apoſtles and firſt Chriſtian church; and we freely confeſs, as our bleſſed Lord has taught us (*o*), that "ſalvation "is of the Jews." He revealed not himſelf to the Gentiles, he would not anſwer a word to Herod, or Pontius Pilate (*p*); but he declared himſelf expreſsly (*q*) to your high-prieſt and ſanhedrim. He did good to all, even to the Gentiles, and healed the ſick. His mercy is over all his works: but much more eminently to his church, his ſegullah. The children's meat is reſerved only for them. There only it is to be had. Therefore are all invited to go thither for it. All are capable of being adopted children, by their admiſſion into the ſegullah: and the children who forſake it, or are juſtly turned out of it, fall to the condition of dogs, for "without are dogs."

The twelve Apoſtles were choſen with reſpect to the ſegullah of the twelve tribes. Our Saviour himſelf makes the alluſion, when he ſaid to them (*r*), "Ye ſhall ſit upon "twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Iſrael." And the names of the twelve tribes are deſcribed (*s*) as written upon the twelve gates of the New Jeruſalem; and

(*m*) Matt. xv. 26. (*n*) Rom. xi. 24. (*o*) John iv. 22. (*p*) Luke xxiii. 9. Matt. xxvii. 14. (*q*) Ibid. xxvi. 64. (*r*) Matt. xix. 28. (*s*) Rev. xxi. 12, 14.

anſwering

anſwering thereunto the names of the twelve Apoſtles, upon the twelve foundations. Then the calling of the Gentiles after the Jews, was in the like manner ſignified in the number of the ſeventy (*t*), whom our Lord ordained ſome time after the Apoſtles. For the Jews divided the world into ſeventy nations, there being juſt ſo many ſons of Shem, Ham, and Japheth, recorded in the tenth of Geneſis, who are ſaid to be divided after their tongues, and after their nations. Thence the Jews conclude, that there was ſeventy nations and ſeventy languages: the languages diſtinguiſhing the nations; becauſe each ſorted to thoſe of his own language; and ſo thoſe of each language made a diſtinct nation. It would be hard otherwiſe to conjecture how the world ſhould be divided into ſeveral nations, without ſuch a force and neceſſity put upon them, and leading them, I may ſay, irreſiſtibly into it, by the miraculous di iſion of languages. For we cannot very eaſily ſuppoſe, that the whole world ſhould meet together, to canton it out into ſeveral nations, by a free and equal vote, and to number out who, and how many ſhould belong to each nation: and to name all the kings or governors of each nation, as it is done in the tenth of Geneſis.

Now the Jews believe that this diviſion of the world into ſeventy nations, was done by God with a particular reſpect to his ſegullah to be afterwards ſet up in Iſrael; whoſe ſons, that deſcended with him into Egypt, are recorded, Gen. xlvi. and are juſt ſeventy. They think this to to be intimated, Deut. xxxii. 8. where it is ſaid, "When the moſt "High divided to the nations their inheritance, when he "ſeparated the ſons of Adam, he ſet the bounds of the "people, according to the number of the children of Iſrael." And ver. 7. ſhews this to have been a tradition of the Jews, in the days of Moſes.

Therefore, as our bleſſed Saviour ſent out at firſt twelve Apoſtles, with reſpect to the twelve tribes, and limited them to preach to none other: ſo did he afterwards appoint other ſeventy alſo, with reſpect to the other nations of the

(*t*) Luke x. 1.

world, who were, in time, to be brought into the ſegullah. And it is obſervable, that in the commiſſion given to the ſeventy, Luke x. there is no ſuch reſtriction as is given to the twelve, Matt. x. 5. of not going to the Gentiles, or Samaritans. Though the door was not fully opened to the Gentiles, till the viſion of the ſheet, Acts x. as before has been ſaid.

After this the Gentiles came in abundantly to the ſegullah. But the firſt Chriſtian church was wholly of the Jews, and eſtabliſhed in Jeruſalem; whoſe biſhop did anſwer to the high-prieſt; and was the principal of unity to the Chriſtian Jews, as the high-prieſt was to the other. So that the ſegullah was preſerved intire, only transferred from the Jewiſh high-prieſt to the Jewiſh biſhop. It was not the Gentiles who converted the Jews to Chriſtianity, but the Jews converted the Gentiles; and the Gentiles came in to the Chriſtian Jewiſh church, and appealed to it upon all occaſions (*u*). And thus it continued till after the deſtruction of Jeruſalem. But the name of Jews ſeems to have been appropriated to the infidel Jews upon their many and notorious rebellions, under their ſeveral falſe Meſſiahs, in which the Chriſtian Jews were not concerned; nor in the puniſhments and odium which thereupon followed, and the laws that were made againſt the Jews, and ſo, by degrees, came to loſe the name of Jews; and became undiſtinguiſhed from the Gentile Chriſtians; for then the name of Jew grew by cuſtom to be a diſcrimination of religion, and not only of a nation: ſo that when a Jew now turns a Chriſtian, he is no longer called a Jew.

But when the time ſhall come (God ſend) that there will be a general converſion of the Jews, then there will be no reaſon to take from them the name of Jews: that name will then only diſtinguiſh their nation. And it will then, no doubt, be the moſt honourable of any upon the earth: to whom pertaineth the adoption, and the glory, and the covenants (*x*), and the giving of the law, and the ſer-

(*u*) Acts xv. (*x*) Rom. ix. 4, 5.

vice

vice of God, and the promiſes; whoſe are the fathers; and of whom, as concerning the fleſh, Chriſt came.

Then it will no longer be thought a reproach in Spain and Portugal to own, that they are (as before has been quoted from the learned Jew) deſcended of the race of the Jews; and to take that name upon themſelves. And other nations will ſtrive for the ſame privilege. Then may be fulfilled, even literally, what is written (*y*), "One ſhall "ſay, I am the Lord's; and another ſhall call himſelf by "the name of Jacob: and another ſhall ſubſcribe with his "hand unto the Lord, and ſurname himſelf by the name "of Iſrael." And thus the name and nation of the Jews will be magnified and exalted above all that are upon the face of the earth: and perpetuated according to the forementioned promiſe of God, while ſun and moon ſhall endure. And then, when the fulneſs of the Gentiles ſhall come in, the Jews will be the head and not the tail, and, as God has promiſed you, (*z*) "Thou ſhalt be above only; "and thou ſhalt not be beneath. And the Lord thy God "ſhall ſet thee on high, above all the nations of the earth."

Then ſhall the ten tribes appear; who now perhaps are the greateſt monarchies upon earth, and then will be acknowledged as ſuch.

See what a glorious ſtate of your nation depends upon your converſion! And it may be more glorious than all this that I have ſaid. Even all that temporal grandeur and empire which you expect. Though, when all that is done, it comes infinitely ſhort of the heavenly and eternal glories, which our Meſſiah has purchaſed for us. And of which all theſe earthly greatneſſes are, in their utmoſt extent, but faint types and ſhadows; and therefore far from the primary and ultimate intendment of the law; which is already fulfilled in the ſpiritual conqueſts and reign of our Meſſiah over all the powers of hell and death.

I take not upon me to determine, that the preſervation of the name and nation of the Jews, upon their converſion,

(*y*) Iſaiah xliv. 5. (*z*) Deut. xxviii. 1, 12.

will

will be juſt as I have ſaid. But this we may depend upon, that the promiſe of God will be fulfilled; and that he will never want means to bring it to paſs: and therefore, that the converſion of the Jews will be no hindrance to the perpetuating of their name and nation, as he has promiſed.

And let their converſion begin (*cum bono Deo*) in this church and nation; where the good providence of God has prepared the way, by freeing you Jews here from thoſe obſtacles which obſtruct your way in other Chriſtian countries. Here you ſee no images or pictures of the great God in our churches; nothing in our worſhip which you can call idolatry or ſuperſtition. Here you may ſee * an epiſcopacy, preſbyters, and deacons, anſwerable to your high-prieſt, prieſts, and Levites: and the ſegullah of the temple perpetuated and continued in the church: in which, as in the temple, and now in your ſynagogues, the public ſervice and worſhip of God is celebrated in the vulgar language of the nation, with the ſolemnity and gravity of a well compoſed and digeſted liturgy. And laſtly, here are no forfeitures or mulcts upon you for your acknowledging and returning to your true Meſſiah. But you may reaſonably preſume, that all due encouragement will be given to you towards ſo glorious a change: and to convince you, that we ſeek not yours but you, the Lord open your eyes!

2. Let me add, that you will be here free from another great ſcandal which you have met with more frequently in Holland, that is, Socinianiſm, to which ſome that oppoſed you there made too near approaches: and if they had converted you, it had not been to Chriſtianity, but rather to idolatry, in paying divine honours and adoration to Chriſt, while they ſuppoſe him but a creature. And they deny † any to be Chriſtians who refuſe this divine adoration and invocation to Chriſt. Whereby they have excluded all our Engliſh Unitarians (as the Socinians here call themſelves) from being Chriſtians, who deny this to Chriſt; though they (ſometimes when they boaſt of their antiquity and

* Hieron. ad Evagr. † Racov. Catech. Sect. 6. c. 1.

univerſality)

univerſality) derive themſelves from theſe tranſmarine Socinians; and pretend to be of one faith with them. But your learned Jew before-mentioned argues againſt them, that Chriſt could not be the heavenly King, unleſs he were God himſelf; (whatever the Socinians dream to the contrary) becauſe that no mere creature could be preſent and aſſiſt every where. * *Non poteſt eſſe Rex Cæleſtis, niſi fuerit Deus ipſe (quicquid Sociniani contrarium ſomniaverint) et enim nulla pura creatura poteſt ubique aſſiſtere & providere.* This vaſt prejudice you will likewiſe avoid in the church of England, where theſe Socinian hereſies, on both ſides, are deteſted and exploded.

If you take ſcandal that ſuch difference ſhould be amongſt thoſe who call themſelves Chriſtians, remember that your Sadducees denied the reſurrection (*a*), and both angels and ſpirits; which takes away the future ſtate of heaven. And this you now believe †, and make it a great article of your creed; and ſay, that it was always the faith of the Jews. Therefore you cannot object it againſt us, that there ſhould be diviſions, even in fundamental points, and ſchiſms amongſt us; ſince there has been the ſame amongſt yourſelves, your Samaritans, Sadducees, &c. And you will not think that this hurts the truth, to thoſe who hold it.

III. There is yet one great and the maſter-difficulty of all, that ſtops the way to your converſion, which I have reſerved to conſider by itſelf in this laſt place, becauſe it is the foundation of all thoſe that lie on your ſide: and which, if clearly removed, will complete your converſion ſo far, as to leave you no other defence, but plain obſtinacy. It is that looſe and precarious account which you give of the ground and foundation of your faith, on purpoſe to avoid that demonſtration which there is for the truth of the Goſpel, and as ſaid before, there is the ſame for the truth of the law: but you will rather quit that irrefragable and ſure foundation, and loſe the certainty of your law, than yield to the ſame or greater certainty that there is for the Goſpel.

* Limbor. Collat. p. 69. † Ibid p. 105. (*a*) Acts xxiii. 8.

Or

Or otherwiſe you have not yet known the true foundation upon which you ought to ſtand.

For the learned Jew * before mentioned eſtabliſhes the faith of the Jews, not upon any grounds of certainty of which other men may judge beſides the Jews, which are common to all men, and ſtand upon the general reaſon and conviction of mankind: but only upon the credit they are to give to their fathers, not as men, but as their fathers, and as they ſtand in that particular relation to them: for God (ſays he) does not ſend us to the Gentiles, to aſk of them; but bids us aſk only of our fathers, and give full credit to them. And therefore (continues he) if the tradition of our fathers told us the ſame of Moſes, as it does of Chriſt, that is, that thoſe matters of fact which are written of him in the law, were not ſo done as he there tells; we ſhould as little believe Moſes, or what he wrote, as we do the Goſpel; which we diſbelieve for the ſame reaſon, viz. Becauſe our fathers tell us, that thoſe things related in the Goſpel, were not ſo done, as is there related.

Anſ. 1. Your fathers have not told you ſo. They have confeſſed to the matters of fact recorded in the Goſpels: nor can you deny them, without anſwering the firſt part of this diſcourſe, and joining with the Deiſts againſt all revelations whatſoever, as well thoſe made to Moſes, as thoſe given by Chriſt. Your fathers indeed ſaid, that Chriſt wrought wonderful works by the power of Beelzebub. But that is confeſſing to the matter of fact; and may be objected againſt the miracles of Moſes, or any other whatſoever: which is before conſidered.

But as your fathers, who believed not in Chriſt when he came, could not, nor did they deny the matters of fact of Chriſt; and ſo give the ſtrongeſt ſort of evidence, that of enemies to the truth of them; and, conſequently, to the truth of his doctrine; which they were brought to vouch: ſo, as before is told, many myriads of your fathers did embrace his doctrine; and by the computation there made,

* Limbor. Collat. p. 130.

there muſt be many more myriads of their poſterities, than of the infidel Jews. So that here the queſtion is not betwixt the tradition of your fathers and of the Gentiles; but of thoſe of your fathers who did believe, and thoſe who did not believe in Chriſt: for Chriſtianity is nothing elſe but a tradition of the Jews, to which the Gentiles did come in. For, as ſhewn before, the firſt Chriſtian church was wholly Jewiſh, without any mixture of the Gentiles for a conſiderable time.

Now then, ſince you have the tradition of your fathers on both ſides, what method are you to take? What method did you take in the contrary traditions of the ten tribes, which grew among them, in ſucceeding ages, after their defection to idolatry under Jeroboam? Your learned Jew * gives a good rule, *viz.* To recur to the original pretended of each tradition: and there ſee upon what foundation it began. That of Moſes was grounded upon miracles exhibited before all the people. Not ſo of Jeroboam, who pretended no ſuch thing; only to give a different expoſition of the law of Moſes to countenance his idolatry; which expoſition became, in time, a tradition to their poſterities.

And this is exactly your caſe, as to Chriſtianity. Your fathers did at firſt embrace it upon the conviction of thoſe many miracles ſhewn publicly before their faces. But thoſe of your fathers who did not believe, did not deny the matters of fact; only put a different conſtruction upon them, ſaying that they were wrought by Beelzebub.

And thoſe Jews who believed, and their poſterities, are many more (as before ſhewn) than thoſe Jews who remained in their infidelity. If that were an argument. For the tradition of two tribes was true, and that of ten was falſe: therefore we muſt recur to the original; and that muſt determine the tradition on either ſide. And the argument inſiſted upon in the firſt part againſt the Deiſts ſtands whole and irrefragably on our ſide; and beſides has the tradition of all your fathers, ſo far as to acknowledge the matters of

* Limbor. Collat. N. v. p. 138, 140.

fact, (which in conſequence is the whole) and the major number were convinced by them. Or if not the major number then, yet certainly much more ſo now in their poſterities; having, by the miraculous providence of God, eſcaped the dreadful deſtruction at Jeruſalem, and under your ſeveral falſe Meſſiahs, which purſued thoſe of your fathers only who hardened themſelves in their obſtinacy againſt Chriſt. So that the tradition of your fathers does not lie in your way, to prejudice you againſt Chriſtianity: the moſt it can oblige you to, is to examine the ſeveral traditions of your fathers; and that is it to which we would invite you. Conſider then firſt the tradition of your Chriſtian fathers, who call themſelves by the name of their Meſſiah, as you have done by the names of your fathers, Heber, and Iſrael, and Judah. And this was foretold by the prophet, (*b*) "Thou ſhalt be called by a new name, "which the mouth of the Lord ſhall name." Therefore though theſe your fathers have loſt the name of Jews, yet they may ſay in the words of the ſame prophet (*c*), "Doubt-"leſs thou art our Father, tho' Abraham be ignorant of "us, and Iſrael acknowledge us not; thou, O Lord, art "our Father, our Redeemer, thy name is from everlaſting." This is an everlaſting name by which they are now called, even the name of our God; whereas they were heretofore called only by the name of your fathers in the fleſh; but now of your Father in heaven. Conſider, I ſay, the tradition of theſe your Chriſtian fathers, that it is on the affirmative ſide; whereas the tradition of your unbelieving fathers is altogether upon the negative; particularly in that great article of our faith the reſurrection of Chriſt. Which being done in the ſight only of a few ſoldiers who were capable of being bribed, you truſt wholly to their *no* evidence, that "his diſciples ſtole him away while they ſlept." For how could they know this, if they were aſleep? Yet this is all the foundation you have for your negative. But for the affirmative, there were (*d*) many infallible proofs,

(*b*) Iſaiah lxii. 3. (*c*) Ibid. lxiii. 16. (*d*) Acts i. 3.

Chriſt being "ſeen of his diſciples forty days, and ſpeaking "of the things pertaining to the kingdom of God. (*e*) He "was ſeen of Cephas, then of the twelve, after that he "was ſeen of above five hundred brethren at once; of whom "the greater part (ſays our Apoſtle) remain unto this pre-"ſent," when he wrote. Theſe were too many to be bribed, not with "large money (*f*)," as you gave to the ſoldiers; but with ſtripes and impriſonments, and death, to have concealed ſuch a forgery; when any one of them might not only have avoided theſe perſecutions, but, no doubt, have got much more "large money" than you gave to the ſoldiers, for ſuch a fooliſh excuſe as they made: for any one of theſe five hundred could have effectually diſcovered the contrivance, if it was one, and ſtifled Chriſtianity in its cradle; and one evidence on that ſide would, at that time, have born down five hundred on the other. And the Chriſtians putting you to the trial of this, when theſe many witneſſes were alive; and that not one of them could be tampered with, either by bribes or threats! That all ſhould ſtand it out, even to the death!

But we have ſurer evidence than all this; even infallible: and that is, the many miracles which the Apoſtles ſhewed in atteſtation to the truth of this. Miracles as flagrant and notorious as thoſe which Chriſt himſelf had wrought; and which have all the four marks before-mentioned, that do infallibly demonſtrate the truth of any matter of fact.

Theſe are the grounds of the tradition of your Chriſtian fathers.

And all the ground for the tradition of your unbelieving fathers, is nothing elſe but that ſenſeleſs ſtory of the ſoldiers, ſufficiently ridiculous to confute itſelf, were there no evidence at all on the other ſide.

Let me add to this, that your Chriſtian fathers had all theſe difficulties to ſtrugg'e with, which do now keep you back from Chriſtianity. They hung as much as you upon the expectation of a temporal kingdom of the Meſſiah.

(*e*) 1 Cor. xv. 5, 6, 7, 8. (*f*) Matt. xxviii. 12.

The

The very Apoſtles of our Lord were not wrought off of this, all the time that he lived with them; and they reſumed their hopes of it after his reſurrection (*g*). They were ignorant of his reſurrection (*h*). "For as yet they knew "not the Scripture, that he muſt riſe again from the dead." And ſo far were they from concerting of this, that they would not believe it, when it was firſt told them by thoſe who had ſeen it. (*i*) "Their words ſeemed to them as idle "tales, and they believed them not." And when all the other Apoſtles had ſeen the Lord, yet would not Thomas believe even them; till he had more than even ocular demonſtration, to thruſt his hand into his ſide, and put his finger into the print of the nails (*k*). Nor was this peculiar to Thomas; for when Chriſt appeared firſt to the reſt, they were as hard to believe. And he afforded them the like demonſtration (*l*), not only to ſee and hear him ſpeak to them, but to handle him, and examine the wounds in his hands and feet, and further to eat before them. And as a yet more forcible conviction, he minded them how he had told them all this before; and that it was agreeable to the Scriptures of the Old Teſtament. "And he ſaid unto them, theſe are "the words I ſpake unto you, while I was yet with you, "that all things muſt be fulfilled which were written in "the law of Moſes, and in the Prophets, and in the Pſalms "concerning me. Then opened he their underſtanding, "that they might underſtand the Scriptures; and ſaid unto "them, Thus it is written, and thus it behoved Chriſt to "ſuffer, and to riſe from the dead the third day: and that "repentance and remiſſion of ſins ſhould be preached in "his name, among all nations, beginning at Jeruſalem. "And ye are witneſſes of theſe things." Our bleſſed Lord ſuffered his diſciples to be thus ſlow in believing, thereby to confirm our faith the more. But he would not permit them to proceed upon their miſſion, notwithſtanding all this evidence, till they ſhould have yet further credentials, ſuch

(*g*) Acts i. 6. (*h*) John xx. 9. (*i*) Luke xxiv. 11. (*k*) John xx. 25, 27. (*l*) Luke xxiv. 39 to 49.

as no man could refuſe, without the higheſt obſtinacy, and which is the utmoſt that God can outwardly exhibit; that is, the power of miracles. "But tarry ye (ſays he) in the "city of Jeruſalem, until ye be endued with power from "on high." And this was granted them at firſt, by a moſt ſtupendous miracle, in the deſcent of the Holy Ghoſt at Pentecoſt, and inſpiring them, in an inſtant, with all languages: which was viſible not only to the Jews, but to multitudes of other nations, then at Jeruſalem (*m*). And the ſame day, about three thouſand were converted. And by the many miracles which the Apoſtles were enabled to work afterwards, many μυριάδες, myriads of the Jews, and a great company of your prieſts were obedient to the faith (*n*). Theſe were your fathers; therefore reject not their tradition. Compare with this, the tradition of your other fathers who believed not; which is built only upon a negative, of which there is no proof at all.

Then I deſire you to recollect what has been ſaid before, of your having forſaken the conſtant tradition of your fathers before Chriſt came, in ſo many particulars as are there ſet down; and having invented new and contrary traditions, on purpoſe to prejudice yourſelves againſt Chriſtianity.

And if tradition muſt take place, why not the moſt ancient? Theſe ſure are moſt authentic. And they are more traditions than the latter: for it is age that makes tradition. Yet you reject the moſt ancient traditions of your fathers; while you ſet up their tradition as your only infallible rule!

This is the firſt anſwer I give to your objection of following the tradition of your fathers, upon which you lay ſo great a ſtreſs; and which being removed, you will have little left to ſay. But though I think this anſwer very ſufficient, yet becauſe this is the main hinge of the controverſy, as your learned Jew has ſtated it; and inſiſts mightily and almoſt ſolely upon it, through all his diſpute with Limborch: and thence we may reaſonably ſuppoſe that it is the *jugulum*

(*m*) Acts ii. 41. (*n*) Ibid. xxi. 20. vi. 7.

cauſæ,

cauſe, the laſt effort you have to defend yourſelves, I will therefore proceed upon it, even as ſtated by yourſelves, and ſhew further the weakneſs of it, ſuppoſing that none of your fathers had embraced Chriſtianity.

Anſw. 2. This, as ſtated by yourſelves, is running into that circle, in which the church of Rome have intangled themſelves, of proving the authority of the church by the Scriptures; and the authority of the Scriptures from the church. Which cannot be avoided, while, in this diſpute, they conſider the church as exerciſing any act of authority: for that authority muſt be proved, before it can be acknowledged. And if it be proved from the Scripture; and the Scripture receives its authority from the church; then the authority of the church is proved only from the authority of the church.

But if the church be brought herein only as witneſſes, with the reſt of mankind, upon the common reaſon and principles of mankind; the aſſurance of the ſenſes of mankind and the infallible manner of deducing matters of fact from former ages, and diſtinguiſhing the true from the falſe; and thoſe which are certainly true, from thoſe which only may be true (which is the method taken in the firſt part of this diſcourſe) then the authority of the Holy Scriptures, and the facts therein contained, being eſtabliſhed upon the common principles of mankind; the church may juſtly build her authority upon what ſhe finds given to her in the Holy Scriptures.

And thus may you juſtly argue from what you find attributed to your church by the law: having firſt vouched the truth of the matters of fact of Moſes, as delivered in your law, from the notoriety of the facts, and impoſſibility of any impoſture therein, as is done in the firſt part.

But if, as this your learned Jew does, you ground the truth of Moſes himſelf, and all that is ſaid of him in your law, and conſequently of the law itſelf, upon that credit only which your law bids you to have to your fathers, as being your fathers, you give up the whole cauſe; you run into the circle of believing the law for your fathers; and

your fathers for the law, which is proving the ſame thing by itſelf.

Anſw. 3. Your Samaritans vouched the tradition of your fathers and theirs, againſt you. (*o*) "Our fathers wor-"ſhipped in this mountain; and ye ſay that in Jeruſalem "is the place where men ought to worſhip."

Your ten tribes did vouch likewiſe the tradition of their fathers (*p*) for their idolatries, and many vile abominations. Nay even the two tribes, in their captivity, vouched the ſame. (*q*) "We will burn incenſe unto the queen of "heaven; and pour out drink-offering unto her, as we "have done, we and our fathers, our kings, and our princes, "in the cities of Judah, and in the ſtreets of Jeruſalem."

If you ſay, that they deviated in this from the law; and that in this caſe we muſt have recourſe to the firſt giving of the law, and the ocular evidence that was then ſhewn to all the people of its being ſent to them from God; as has been before quoted from your learned Jew: I anſwer, that this is ſtill appealing from the tradition of your fathers; and ſhews that there is ſomething elſe to be looked to. This is owning that there may be a corrupt tradition of your fathers.

And therefore, though the Jews were bidden to learn theſe things from their fathers, who had ſeen them (there was all the reaſon in the world for it, for they could learn them from none other) yet the aſſurance and credibility of what their fathers had ſeen was not grounded upon that relation in which they ſtood to them, as being their fathers; but as their fathers were men, and as ſuch could not be deceived in what they ſaw and heard. And the aſſurance of that tradition by which theſe facts were conveyed to after ages, was not ſolely grounded upon the kindneſs and affection of their fathers, who cannot be ſuppoſed willing to impoſe upon their poſterities, as this learned Jew does argue; but upon the nature of the tradition, which was incapable of any impoſture, as has been argued in the firſt part.

(*o*) John iv. 20. (*p*) Jer. ix. 14. (*q*) Ibid. xliv. 14.

For

For other men will pretend to the ſame kindneſs toward their children, as the Jews; and men that are deceived themſelves, will tranſmit their deceits to their children. Thus all errors are continued: therefore we muſt recur to the original, and there examine the truth upon the common principles of mankind, and ſee how this has been tranſmitted to us; and bring the nature of the tradition to the ſtandard of the ſame common principles.

But if the Jews will ſtick to the tradition of their fathers, as the ultimate rule, from which there is to be no appeal, then they muſt ſtick to all their traditions, right or wrong. For if they pretend to any rule whereby to judge of their traditions, then their traditions are not the ultimate rule.

And it is ſtrange to ſee how far this falſe notion has carried the Jews even to acknowledge no other certain proof for the being of a God, but the law of Moſes; nor any other for that, but the tradition of their fathers, which I come next to inſiſt upon.

Anſw. 4. This foundation which the Jews have given of their faith, can never convert any other people to their religion, becauſe others have the ſame deference for their fathers, as the Jews have for theirs; and the Jews can give no reaſon to the contrary. Therefore the Jews inſiſting only upon the tradition of their fathers, without further proof, give the ſame liberty to all, in whatſoever they have received from their fathers.

This our learned Jew confeſſes: for being preſſed by Limborch to ſhew what arguments the Jews have againſt the Heathen, he freely owns that they have none at all, and beſtows a whole chapter to * prove it: That the Jews can only diſpute with the Chriſtians, who acknowledge the books of Moſes; for that the Jews have no other topic whereby to prove certainly even that there is a God, nor any other proof for the books of Moſes than the tradition of their fathers, who they ſuppoſed would not deceive them; and becauſe theſe books bid them hearken to their fathers,

* Limbor. Collat. p. 136.

and

and not to the Heathen. And if any ſhould deny theſe books, ſays he, "*Eſt Atheus, quia non habet aliunde Dei exiſtentiam certiſſime & indubitanter credat: quamvis ex aliis principiis poſſit probabiliter conjectari: neque enim ſufficit ratio, neque quod aliquis dixerit, de quo eadem fieret inquiſitio. Hunc igitur convincere eſt impoſſibile, æque ac Dei exiſtentiam ac Moſis prophetiam, per quam nobis unice conſtat eſſe Deum.*" i. e. "He is an Atheiſt, becauſe he has no other way whereby certainly to believe the exiſtence of a God: though from other principles it may probably be conjectured: for neither is reaſon ſufficient, nor what any man ſays, of which the ſame inquiſition is to be made. Therefore it is equally impoſſible to convince ſuch a one of the exiſtence of a God, as of the prophecy of Moſes, by which only it appears to us that there is a God." This is mad work! for there could be no ground to believe Moſes, but upon the ſuppoſition of the previous notion of a God, who ſent him. How elſe did his miracles vouch his being ſent of God? And yet, ſays the Jew, by the prophecy of Moſes ONLY it appears to us that there is a God! and therefore he concludes, that as for a Heathen who rejects both the Law and the Goſpel, *Ille neque ad legem Moſis, neque ad evangelium ſolida ratione convinci queat.* i. e. "That he cannot be convinced by any ſolid reaſon, of the truth either of the Law of Moſes, or of the Goſpel:" and therefore that there is no diſputing with ſuch an one. *Contra ethnicum non oportet diſputare*, is the title of this chapter; i. e. That we ought not to diſpute againſt an Heathen. For this the Jew confeſſes freely, when being aſked, if an Heathen ſhould deny that Moſes was a prophet, only a cunning man who impoſed upon the people, by what arguments the Jew could prove the divine miſſion of Moſes, which would not as ſtrongly prove the divine miſſion likewiſe of Chriſt? *Reſpondeo* (ſays he) *me nulla demonſtratione Moſis prophetiam divinam eſſe, contra ethnicum probare poſſe, quippe id demonſtrabile non eſt.* i. e. "I anſwer, that I cannot prove by demonſtration againſt an Heathen that the prophecy of Moſes is divine, becauſe it is not demonſtrable."

And

And he ſays the ſame as to the Mahometans, that they have their tradition, too, derived from their fathers, of the miracles and divine miſſion of Mahomet; and therefore that they can ſay to us, *Quod ſi Mahometi revelationem negaverimus, Moſis etiam & Chriſti negare poſſunt, cum nullam rationem producere queamus, quæ ſuæ ſectæ confirmationi non inſerviat*, i. e. That if we deny the revelation of Mahomet, they may likewiſe deny thoſe of Moſes and of Chriſt, ſeeing we can produce no reaſon for them that will not ſerve likewiſe for the confirmation of their ſect. And he grounds all upon this bottom, which he takes as granted; *Quod alicujus præteriti nec etiam Dei exiſtentia, ulla ratione demonſtrari poteſt.* i. e. That the exiſtence of any thing that is paſt, no, not of God, can be demonſtrated by any reaſon. *Ideo argumentum nequit eſſe cum ethnico.* That therefore there cannot be any argument againſt an Heathen.

Now here I beſeech you to conſider how you have given up the whole foundation upon which the truth of your Law does ſtand, leſt you ſhould be forced to ſubmit to the truth of the Goſpel, which ſtands upon the ſame foundation. You have rendered your Law wholly precarious, while you tell all the world that there is no reaſon to be given for it; that is, none to convince an Heathen, a Mahometan, or any who denies it. For reaſon is reaſon to all the world; and nothing can be true for which there is not a reaſon ſufficient to convince gainſayers.

You have by this confirmed both Heathens and Mahometans, as well as Chriſtians, in what you think to be groſs errors, and diſpleaſing to God, by allowing them the ſame foundation for their faith that you have for yours, i. e. the tradition of their fathers. And therefore you think that they have the ſame reaſon to ſtick to theirs as you have to ſtick to yours; which your learned Jew often confeſſes. Speaking of the reaſons produced on the Chriſtian ſide, he ſays *, *Et mea ſaltem ſententia ſatis bonæ ſunt & efficaces, ut Chriſtiani eas amplectantur, & in ſua fide roborentur: non vero*

* Limbor. Collat. p. 132. & alibi paſſim.

ut

ut Judæi Chriſtiani fiant. i. e. "They are, in my opinion, good reaſons, and ſufficient for the Chriſtians to embrace them, and to be ſtrengthened in their faith; but not for the Jews, that they ſhould become Chriſtians." This is a ſtrange ſort of reaſoning; for theſe reaſons cannot be good reaſons, unleſs they are true; and they cannot be true to one, and falſe to another, if they are rightly apprehended, unleſs the ſame reaſon can be both true and falſe. It is impoſſible that both Judaiſm and Chriſtianity can be true; as impoſſible as that our Jeſus is the Meſſiah, and that he is not the Meſſiah. And there can be no good reaſon for our believing him to be the Meſſiah, which muſt not operate as ſtrongly for your believing of it: that is, if it be true, you ought to believe it; and if it be not true, we ought not to believe it. Therefore your yielding that we have ſufficient reaſon to believe it, muſt conclude inevitably againſt yourſelves, that you think it to be true: otherwiſe you could not think that we had ſufficient reaſon to believe it.

If you ſay that this was a ſlip in that learned Jew; that he ought not to have made this conceſſion, and that you are not bound by it; conſider that this was all that was left him to ſay; that he has managed your cauſe with great ſubtilty; that he took this way to avoid anſwering the plain and undeniable reaſons which prove the truth of the Goſpel, by yielding them to be ſuch as to Chriſtians, but that they are not the ſame as to the Jews; which turns the cauſe upon a new foot, and diverts the queſtion.

But if you like not his management, and think you can make a better plea for yourſelves, then you muſt anſwer the reaſons given on the behalf of Chriſtianity, particularly thoſe urged in the firſt part againſt the Deiſts. And this is all that I deſire to bring you to. And now you have your choice, whether you will do this, and put your cauſe upon this iſſue, or otherwiſe ſtick to that evaſion which this learned Jew has made for you.

There is another thing I would aſk you upon this head. You expect the converſion of all the world to your religion, in the reign of your Meſſiah; and you have given this as

one reaſon of your diſperſion, that you might convert all nations among whom you are ſcattered, as has been taken notice of before.

Now I would aſk, how you are to convert them? You confeſs that there are no arguments to be uſed againſt them: you leave the Chriſtians in full poſſeſſion of their faith, and ſay, they have ſufficient reaſon for it: and for Heathens, &c. who do not acknowledge the books of Moſes, you ſay they are not to be diſputed with. How then are they to be converted by you?

Beſides that, your learned Jew complains that the Jews are perverted to the idolatries and other corruptions of the nations where they live, inſtead of converting theſe nations.

But ſuppoſe that it will be otherwiſe when your Meſſiah comes; and that then, or ſome time before, you will begin to convert the nations, this converſion cannot be by arguments, for you confeſs you have none againſt them. How then? There is no other way but that of Mahomet, by the ſword; and this is the way it ſeems that you expect. Your learned Jew* ſays, that there is no other miracle needful for the Meſſiah, whereby to vouch his miſſion, but one only, viz. "To gather the Jews out of all countries of the world; to reſtore the throne of David to its ancient and a greater majeſty; and to bring all kings and nations to the true worſhip of God, and to love and eſteem the Jews, which (ſays he) would be ſuch a miracle, and ſo notorious, as to leave no room to doubt of it."

The uncertainty of this mark of your Meſſiah is ſhewn before.

In the next place this would be no greater a miracle than the ſucceſſes of the Romans, and others from a ſmall beginning; or of Mahomet, who boaſts the ſame; and to which every wickedneſs has a title, ſo it be proſperous enough.

Your Rabbi Menaſſe (de Reſurrectione, l. ii. c. xxi. as quoted by Hornbeck contra Judæos, l. ii. c. 1. p. 114) gives

* Limbor. Collat. p. 55.

up

up this argument, and ſays, *Non eſt tantum miraculum*— "That it is not ſo great a miracle if the Meſſiah ſhould conquer many nations and empires, ſince we ſee it often happen, that mean and abject men have ariſen to kingdoms and empires, and become lords of many lands." Yet this learned Jew, who writes later, is forced to come back again to this no miracle, for they can find no other.

And in expectation of this, you reject all the true and indubitable miracles of our Meſſiah, and his much more miraculous conqueſts of the Gentile world, as well as of myriads of the Jews, without force of arms, or any allurements to fleſh and blood. But on the contrary, by inviting them to ſelf-denial, ſufferings, and death; which ſure is a more extraordinary, and more miraculous ſort of conqueſt, and ſhews more of divine power than what is performed by the arm of fleſh, outward force, or ſenſual incitements, like that which you expect, and like that of Mahomet, and other impoſtors.

But though you ſhould conquer, as you expect, yet it will not follow that you will thereby convert all nations.

It is not in a man's own power to change his ſentiment of things without ſufficient reaſon to convince him, at leaſt what he thinks a ſufficient reaſon; much leſs can ſuch a force be put upon him by any other. No outward conqueſt can reach to the ſoul, or alter our judgment and underſtanding.

And therefore, according to what you now profeſs, that you have no argument on your ſide, but your long expected conqueſt, it will not follow, if you obtained it to-morrow, that you ſhould thereby convert any one man in the world to your religion. For perhaps there is not one man in the world that thinks conqueſt alone to be the true deciſion of controverſies in religion: and if ſo, then every man muſt think that religion to be falſe, which pretends to no other title but that of conqueſt.

See how inextricably you have involved yourſelves on all ſides, in thoſe various ſhifts you ſet up to harden yourſelves againſt the flagrant truth of the Chriſtian religion! You

have

have thereby undermined the whole foundation upon which the truth of your Law itſelf is demonſtrable, and which you can never recover by any other means than thoſe which eſtabliſh the truth of our Jeſus being the Meſſiah; which are the ſame that eſtabliſh the truth of Moſes, and (as has been ſaid) are not compatible to any impoſtor whatſoever.

You pretend to us Chriſtians, that you have no arguments againſt the Deiſts or Heathen. Why? Becauſe it is impoſſible for you to bring any arguments for the truth of Moſes, which will not likewiſe demonſtrate more ſtrongly the truth of our Jeſus. But to the Heathen you ſay not ſo; you pretend to argue with them, when you can get out of ſight of Chriſtianity; then you proceed freely upon the certain and indubitable proofs which you have for the truth of Moſes, when you are not afraid that Chriſtianity ſhould come in at the ſame door. This appears in your book Coſri, (whether that ſtory be real or feigned) which contains your arguments againſt the Heathen. But in the preſence of Chriſtianity they are all ſtruck dumb, like the oracles among the Heathen. Not that the arguments for the truth of Moſes are fallacious like thoſe oracles; but as their deceit was ſuperſeded by the brightneſs of the Goſpel, ſo are you ſtopped from daring to make uſe of the truth, becauſe it makes againſt you; and you are forced to betray the cauſe of Moſes, while you ſtand out againſt that of Chriſt. You cannot be true Jews or diſciples of Moſes, till you turn Chriſtians: then may you (as we do) freely urge the abſolute certainty of the revelation made to Moſes: which now you dare not do, becauſe the ſame topics prove as demonſtrably the truth of Chriſtianity: rather than admit of which, you have laid your foundation in the ſand of your fathers traditions, ſo explained, as to give you no advantage above all the traditionary fables of other nations, which you allow to have the ſame motives of credibility to them, as yours to you; and conſequently, to be as true as yours.

This was not the method you took to make proſelytes before Chriſt came. Then you had free uſe of your arguments, and a ſucceſs proportionable; but now you ſeem careleſs

careleſs what becomes of your religion, ſo you can overthrow Chriſtianity. Therefore having choſen a falſe and inſufficient foundation for your own faith, you would compliment ours with the ſame.

As your learned Jew * does, when he aſks, "What reaſon there is why a Heathen ſhould believe any who preached to him the Chriſtian faith, and miracles of Chriſt and his Apoſtles? The firſt part of this diſcourſe againſt the Deiſts is a direct anſwer to this queſtion, and ſerves the Jews as well as the Deiſts; but this learned Jew did, and all the reſt of you muſt think that queſtion to be unanſwerable, and as ſuch it is here propoſed. But then will not the queſtion occur, What reaſon the Chriſtians have to believe it? or the Jews to believe the law and miracles of Moſes? Your learned Jew was aware of this, and therefore obviates it thus: *Neque par ratio eſt de Chriſtianis & Judæis, qui non interruptâ traditione*, &c. That there was not the ſame reaſon for the belief of the Chriſtians and the Jews, who received it by an uninterrupted tradition from their fathers. This puts the Chriſtian faith upon as good a bottom as the Jewiſh, that is the ſame, viz. tradition from their fathers; and if they have no other, they both ſtand precariouſly, and have no more to ſay for themſelves even than the Heathen. This the learned Jew does not oppoſe, and therefore explains himſelf, that by his queſtion he did not mean thoſe Heathen who had long ſince believed the Goſpel, and ſo received it by tradition from their fathers. *Sed quare nunc barbaræ gentes, in ſuis ritibus ſemper educatæ, noſtris traditionibus fidem præſtabunt, eo ſolum quod a nobis proponantur.* i. e. But why the now Heathen nations, who have always been educated in their own rites, ſhould embrace our traditions, merely becauſe they are propoſed to them by us? Indeed merely becauſe they are propoſed is a very bad reaſon; and yet it is all that the Jew thinks there is in the caſe, as before is ſhewn. But here he joins the Chriſtian and the Jewiſh faith together, and makes both ſtand upon the ſame bottom,

* Limbor. Collat. p. 51.

and

and that the ſame with the foundation even of the Heathen religion; that rather than not overthrow Chriſtianity, he would ſink his own religion with it, and leave no true revealed religion in the world, (all others but theſe falſely pretending to it) and ſo ſerve the ends of the Deiſts to all intents and purpoſes.

He endeavours to rivet this, as he thinks, ſecurely, by the long tradition of the popiſh legends, which, he ſays *, were believed by all Chriſtendom for more than a thouſand years, and no leſs faith given to them than to the Goſpel itſelf. His miſtakes in reciting matter of fact I am not now upon; theſe prevailed only in the Latin church, nor in all that neither, nor for ſo long a time as he imagines. The greateſt part of the Chriſtian church in the Eaſt, in Africa, &c. never heard of moſt of them, nor have to this day: and thoſe of the church of Rome, who, though men of ſenſe, pretended to believe them, yet durſt not put them upon the ſame foot with the holy Goſpel. The learned and more knowing among them called them Piæ Fraudes, and pleaded for them only as ſuch, as pious cheats to raiſe the devotion of the ſimple and more ignorant amongſt the people; but (as ſaid before †) none of them can pretend to thoſe four marks ſet down ‡, whereby the truth of the miracles of Moſes and of Chriſt are infallibly demonſtrated. And therefore if any of theſe legends were true, in whole or in part, yet we cannot have the ſame grounds for believing of them as we have for the Law and the Goſpel.

IV. Both of which you ſeem willing to miſtake, in your deep prejudice to the Goſpel. For the chief end of the coming of the Meſſiah being (*r*) to bruiſe the ſerpent's head, who had ſeduced man to ſin, (*s*) "To finiſh the tranſgreſſion, and to make an end of ſin, and to make reconciliation for iniquity," you now contend, that men were never under the curſe of God. § *Quod neque aliquando fuerunt*

* Limbor. Collat. p. 133. † Short and Eaſy Method with the Deiſts, p. 5. ‡ Ibid. p. 42. (*r*) Gen. iii. 15. (*s*) Dan. ix. 24. § Limbor. Collat. p. 54, 55.

homines ſub Dei maledictione—Quod non conſtat ex toto ſacro textu illa ira Dei contra genus humanum, neque illa æterna maledictio: neque memini in quatuor Evangeliis me legiſſe hoc ſecretum a Chriſto fuiſſe detectum: quare putamus id poſtea inventum, ut aliis dogmatibus fundamentum ſubſterneretur; *i. e.* That this wrath of God againſt mankind, nor that eternal curſe, does appear in the whole ſacred text: neither do I remember to have read in the four Goſpels that this ſecret was diſcovered by Chriſt: therefore we think that it was invented afterwards, to lay a foundation for other opinions. This is a bold and deſperate aſſertion. Let any man read Matth. xxv. 46. and John v. 29. and ſee whether eternal judgment be not there threatened? And whether theſe be not as it were repeating the very words of Daniel, chap. xii. 2. That "many of them that ſleep in the duſt of the earth ſhall "awake, ſome to everlaſting life, and ſome to ſhame and "everlaſting contempt." Compare likewiſe Mark ix. 44. with Iſaiah lxvi. 24. and then tell whether there is not a puniſhment after death for the wicked: and whether this be not revealed as well in the Old Teſtament as in the New?

If the Jew will criticiſe (as ſome Chriſtians have done) upon the words eternal and everlaſting, and ſay, that they mean not a duration without end, I will give two anſwers.

1. That my buſineſs with the Jew is not now about the eternity of hell: but whether there be any puniſhment at all after death. Becauſe all the ends which the Jew propoſes of the Meſſiah's coming, reſpect only this life. And they deny any that are dead to have any benefit by the Meſſiah *. And, if ſo, then his making reconciliation for iniquity cannot deliver any mortal from the puniſhment after death.

And this puniſhment being deſcribed in the texts before quoted, and ſeveral others of the Old Teſtament, to be exceedingly greater than any we can endure in this life; conſequently the greateſt benefit that we can receive by the Meſſiah, is totally fruſtrated by the Jews. And they cannot

* Limbor. Collat. Num. xvii. p. 70.

deny but that the ends which the Christians propose for the coming of the Messiah, are exceedingly more noble and more beneficial than those which they propose: and fully as agreeable to the letter of the text, of bruising the head of the serpent, and making reconciliation for iniquity; and something more so, than our deliverance from worldly enemies, who are not so properly called the serpent as the devil is: and our deliverance from his power is more strictly called a making an end of sin, and finishing of transgression; and more truly an everlasting deliverance (in whatever sense you will take that word) than any temporal deliverance. For if by everlasting you mean only temporal, yet it is the highest expression of temporal, and the greatest of temporal deliverances.

Let me not be mistaken, as if by eternal and everlasting, the worm not dying, and the fire that never will be quenched, &c. I favoured at all their constructions which would make all these to mean nothing but temporary, though a very long duration; but I would not intermix new subjects in this discourse, and expatiate into long digressions, especially where the present controversy does not require it. Therefore I go to my second answer.

2. If these words, eternal, &c. can be thus turned, or if they cannot, I desire to know from the Jews, what plain text they have in all the law of Moses for everlasting life in heaven, and in order thereunto, for the resurrection of the dead, which they profess firmly to believe? They gather these from texts which, as themselves confess, do bear another, and a temporal meaning, respecting their outward state in this world: but which withal do (they say) typically represent their future glorious state in heaven, their true and everlasting Canaan. Yet they will not allow any thing in their law to be a type of the Messiah! Why? Because the law does not expressly say, that such a thing is a type of the Messiah. Which yet it says as much as that Canaan was a type of heaven: that there will be any resurrection of the dead; or eternal life after that. What express Scripture have they for what Rabbi Manasseh Ben Israel, in his

treatiſe of the Reſurrection of the Dead, does affirm to be the common opinion of the rabbins, *viz.* That all the Iſraelites, even thoſe that are dead, ſhall be partakers of the kingdom of the Meſſiah: * and that to this end, all thoſe that are dead, ſhall be raiſed again; by which miracle the wicked being converted, ſhall acknowledge the true God, and forſake their errors: that then there ſhall be an end of this world, and a new one ariſe, or a change of this into a much better condition, wherein the moon ſhall be as bright as the ſun, and the light of the ſun ſevenfold more than it is now: at which time the demons and evil ſpirits ſhall be deſtroyed; and the trees bear fruit every month: and then that God ſhall make a noble feaſt to the righteous out of the fiſh the leviathan: and that there ſhall be peace among the wild beaſts; neither ſhall they hurt men in that holy land: that then the temple of God ſhall be built again; and the Holy Land be again divided amongſt the tribes: where they ſhall eat and drink, beget children, and each be married to his own proper wife, &c. This Turks Paradiſe after death, they can gather out of the words of the law. They can find there their ſumptuous fiſh-dinner upon the great whale leviathan! But nothing of the heavenly kingdom of the Meſſiah! Nothing of their deliverance from ſin and hell; but eating and drinking, and lying with women! They ſhould, upon this their ſcheme of the ſtate after death, anſwer the queſtion which one of the Sadducees aſked our Saviour, concerning the ſeven brethren who had one wife, Whoſe wife ſhe ſhould be at the reſurrection?

And now I beſeech you to conſider, is it not a fatal deluſion this, that you ſhould reject all the plain prophecies of the Meſſiah, becauſe they do not, in ſuch expreſs words as you would dictate, lay open every particular of his ſpiritual ſtate and government: and (at the ſame time) turn theſe prophecies to ſuch wild and groundleſs fancies as are no ways typified by your ſacrifices, or any inſtitution in your law; nor can fill up, in any tolerable meaſure, the glories

* Limbor. Collat. p. 221, 222.

and extent of all thoſe magnificent prophecies concerning the kingdom of the Meſſiah, wherein God hath prepared for thoſe who ſhall be thought worthy of it; not wine and women, and eating, ſuch groſs carnal pleaſures, as we are made capable of in this frail life: but ſuch things as (*t*) "ſince the beginning of the world men have not heard, "nor perceived by the ear, neither hath the eye ſeen." Yet becauſe they are not particularly deſcribed (which cannot be ſo as we could underſtand them) you will not believe them, or that they reach beyond enjoyments of ſenſe! And for this ſole reaſon, you reject your Meſſiah, becauſe he brings you glories ſo far beyond all that you looked for. Though that likewiſe, in the above quoted text, and many others of your Scriptures, has been foretold to you.

And it is likewiſe ſhadowed out to you in this, that there was no ſacrifice or expiation in your law for the moſt heinous crimes, ſuch as blaſphemy, idolatry, murder, adultery, inceſt, &c. as your learned Jew confeſſes *.

Nay leſſer ſins than theſe, as that of Eli's (*u*) not effectually reſtraining, though he reproved his ſons, were not to be "purged with ſacrifice, nor offering for ever."

Some Jews fancy, that the yearly ſacrifice of expiation made an atonement for all their ſins.

We ſee not for this of Eli's, and conſequently not for greater ſins.

The yearly ſacrifice was but a ſacrifice, though more ſolemn than the daily ſacrifices; and therefore it purged all thoſe ſins only which could be purged by ſacrifice.

If all the ſins of the Jews had been purged every year, then had they not been remembered, brought to account, and ſo grievouſly puniſhed as we have ſeen, and was often threatened in the law, in after ages, more than to the third and fourth generation. And it was a noted obſervation of your fathers, that there was a grain of the golden calf in all your after-judgments, *i. e.* that that ſin was never totally forgiven: but ſtill called to remembrance upon every freſh

(*t*) Iſaiah lxiv. 4. * Limbor. Collat. p. 209. (*u*) 1 Sam. iii. 14.

provocation. It is ſaid (*x*), "I will viſit upon her the days "of Baalim, wherein ſhe burnt incenſe to them." And all the goodneſs and godly reformation of Joſiah could not pacify God for the ſins of Manaſſeth; which (*y*) he would not pardon; but for them removed Judah out of his ſight. (*z*) "And ſurely this iniquity ſhall not be purged from you, "till ye die, ſaith the Lord God of Hoſts."

Therefore there were ſome ſins which were not purged by the legal ſacrifices: and theſe were the greateſt of their ſins. They were but the leſſer ſort of ſins that were purged by them. How then were the greateſt purged? If you will ſay, by repentance only, without any ſacrifice.

Anſw. The leſſer ſins require repentance: and do they need ſacrifice too; when the greater ſins are purged without it? Or are greater ſins more eaſily purged than the leſſer?

Here then behold your law declaring of itſelf, that it is not perfect. That there was a further and more efficacious ſacrifice and atonement for ſin than what was under the law. And this for the greateſt of your ſins. Then caſt your eye upon that text in your law, (*a*) "Curſed be he that con- "firmeth not all the words of this law to do them." And conſider, that there was no atonement or ſacrifice in your law for the greateſt and moſt heinous breaches of the law. How then ſhall you be delivered from this curſe? Or can you enter into eternal life without your being purged from this curſe? Do you expect to be admitted into heaven, while curſed and in your pollutions? Can any curſed thing enter there? Then reflect upon the deſperateneſs of that poſition of yours, * *Nos vero nec redemptionem quam expectamus, nec Meſſiam ipſum pro animarum ſalute, nec pro gloria æterna conſequenda, neceſſaria eſſe credimus. i. e.* We do believe that neither the deliverance which we expect (by our Meſſiah) nor our Meſſiah himſelf, are neceſſary towards the ſalvation of our ſouls, or for the obtaining of eternal glory. Now then if neither in the law, nor in the future reign which you expect of your

(*x*) Hoſ. ii. 13. (*y*) 2 Kings xxiii. 26. xxiv. 3, 4. (*z*) Iſaiah xxii. 14. (*a*) Deut. xxvii. 26. * Limbor. Collat. p. 98. ad finem.

Meſſiah,

Meſſiah, there will be any propitiation or ſacrifice for the greateſt of your ſins, how do you expect to be purged from them? Or muſt you enter into heaven before you are purged from them? Or were ſacrifices only needleſs ceremonies, and not effectual for the purging of thoſe ſins, which were purgeable by them? Or were greater ſins eaſier purged, that is, by repentance only; than leſſer ſins, which beſides repentance, were not to be purged without ſacrifice alſo?

I confeſs all this is out of doors, and urged to no purpoſe, if it be true which you have advanced (as before quoted) that men, by the fall, were never under the curſe of God: and therefore needed no deliverance from it. That Iſrael was an holy nation, becauſe they are ſo called in Scripture, and that Aaron was commanded to bleſs them: and God ſaid to Balaam that they were bleſſed. All which, ſays your learned Jew *, is ſo contrary to their being eternally curſed, *ut neque Deus ipſe poſſit ea componere.* That God himſelf cannot reconcile it.

I ſuppoſe he intends to come off by the word eternal, that it is not reconcileable with their being eternally under the curſe of God: becauſe there are ſo many places in the law and the prophets which ſpeak of their great wickedneſs, and being under the temporal curſe of God.

But bleſſing is as contrary to curſing in this world as in the next: for they are oppoſites in the nature of the thing. And therefore if the authority of ſuch texts as thoſe before quoted will free them from the eternal, it muſt alſo from the temporal curſe, or from any curſe at all.

But why then are they called holy and bleſſed, if they be under the curſe? I ſuppoſe neither Jew nor Chriſtian need be inſtructed in this, it is ſo known and common a diſtinction; men are called holy or bleſſed upon a perſonal, or a relative account, as they are holy in themſelves, or related to holy things. Thus a nation or people taken into federal covenant with God, more peculiarly than any other nation upon the earth, may be called bleſſed above all the

* Limbor. Collat. p. 55.

nations of the earth: and an holy people, in reſpect of the holineſs of their laws, covenant, promiſes, &c. given to them by God.

Yet theſe may be a wicked and a curſed people, in reſpect to their practice, if they live not purſuant to their holy law. Thus ſaid Moſes to your nation, (*b*) "Underſtand, "therefore, that the Lord thy God giveth thee not this "good land to poſſeſs it, for thy righteouſneſs; for thou "art a ſtiff-necked people." And ſays God himſelf, (*c*) "As I live, ſaith the Lord God, Sodom thy ſiſter hath not "done, ſhe nor her daughters, as thou haſt done, thou and "thy daughters—Neither hath Samaria committed half of "thy ſins." And again, (*d*) "Ye are curſed with a curſe; "for ye have robbed me, even this whole nation." Yet all this while, that nation was called the holy nation: and Jeruſalem the holy city, when it was full of murderers, becauſe there was the temple and ſtated worſhip of God. Are theſe now ſuch contradictions that God himſelf cannot reconcile! Behold the ſame people (*e*) bleſſed and curſed, at the ſame time; but not in the ſame reſpect. Therefore truſt not in your being called the holy people, notwithſtanding of which you ſee you may be curſed: not only here but hereafter! For, as ſaid before, to be bleſſed and curſed, is as great a contradiction in this life as the next: and for a moment, as for eternity. And you find and complain, that you are curſed here upon many temporal accounts. And urge your great ſins as the cauſe of your Meſſiah delaying his coming. Now ſin is as much a contradiction to holineſs, and more than the curſe of afflictions and puniſhment. Therefore if you can reconcile your being the holy people, with your being, at the ſame time, ſuch great ſinners, you have ſolved the contradiction yourſelves, which you thought too hard (when it made againſt you) for God himſelf! And you muſt at laſt grant, after all your ſtruggling, that, by the fall of Adam, men were put under the curſe of God: from which there were no ſacrifices in your law

(*b*) Deut. ix. 6. (*c*) Ezek. xvi. 48, 51. (*d*) Mal. iii. 9. (*e*) Jer. vii. 4.

ſufficient

ſufficient to purge our ſouls: that therefore another and more efficacious ſacrifice than the blood of bulls and of goats was neceſſary for the purging of our ſins. And you reject this ſacrifice of our Meſſiah, upon pretence that it is not clearly and in expreſs words revealed in the Old Teſtament, without any figurative and dubious phraſes. While, at the ſame time, you build your hopes of heaven, and explain the reſurrection of the dead in ſuch a manner, and upon ſuch texts, as by no force can be ſcrewed to thoſe wild meanings you put upon them.

And on the other ſide, when the death and ſacrifice of the Meſſiah; and the ſatisfaction thereby made to God for our ſins are revealed in thoſe plain and expreſs words, (*f*) that he made his ſoul an offering for ſin: that God ſaw the travel of his ſoul, and was ſatisfied: that he laid upon him the iniquity of us all: that he poured out his ſoul unto death: and was numbered with the tranſgreſſors: and he bare the ſin of many: and made interceſſion for the tranſgreſſors, &c. Then (as before ſhewn) death muſt not mean death, nor muſt any of thoſe words be taken literally; but you put ſuch forced and figurative interpretations upon them as can by no means bear, which is proved before.

You except againſt figurative expreſſions; yet you uſe them. You turn the plaineſt words into figures; and then tell us we have no plain words: you deduce conſequences (as your notion of the reſurrection, &c.) from words which are no ways plain, nor can mean what you infer from them: you raiſe doctrines, (as of the leviathan, &c.) from no words at all in your Scriptures; yet you require for our doctrines poſitive words out of your Scriptures! And when you have ſuch, you will not accept of them.

What Scripture can you produce for your monſtrous ſtory of Armillus? which Hornbeck (contra Jud. p. 253.) relates out of your author Aykat Rochel, ſub ſigno Meſſiæ ſeptimo apud Hulſium, p. 51. You ſuppoſe that a company of moſt profligate fellows will invent a new ſin; that they will take a beautiful ſtone ſtatue of a woman, that is in Rome,

(*f*) Iſaiah liii.

and

and warming it, will lie with it; that from thence it will conceive, and at laſt burſting, there will come forth a child, whoſe name ſhall be called Armillus; that he ſhall be twelve cubits high, and the length of a ſpan betwixt his eyes: that he will ſay to the wicked, I am your Meſſiah and your God; that they will believe in him, and make him their king; and that to him will be gathered all the poſterity of Eſau. That your firſt Meſſiah, Ben Joſeph, of the tribe of Ephraim, will fight againſt him, with thirty thouſand Iſraelites; and ſhall have ſucceſs in the firſt battle; but in the ſecond battle, that your Meſſiah will be killed, and his army routed. That the angels will take away the dead body of your Meſſiah, and keep it with thoſe of the patriarchs. That after this ſhall ariſe your ſecond Meſſiah, Ben David, of the tribe of Judah, and Elias with him; to whom the Jews that are left ſhall be gathered, and oppoſe Armillus. That God ſhall deſtroy Armillus and his whole army by fire and brimſtone, and great ſtones caſt down upon them from heaven. Then that Michael ſhall ſound a trumpet ſo loud, as to open the graves, and raiſe the dead in Jeruſalem: and that the firſt Meſſiah, Ben Joſeph, ſhall then be raiſed, who was kept under the gates of Jeruſalem. That then the Meſſiah, Ben David, ſhall be ſent to gather the diſperſed of the Jews from amongſt all nations: all of whoſe kings will bring them upon their ſhoulders, &c.

This is the manner by which you interpret the Scriptures: ſeveral of which are quoted in this relation, (as Pſal. cx. 1. Zech. xiv. 3. Ezek. xxxviii. 22. Obad. i. 18.) as being to be fulfilled in the above-mentioned ſtory of Armillus.

Which, as it is wholly deſtitute of truth, or even probability, the mad excurſion of groundleſs imagination: ſo does it in no ſort come up to the prophecies in the Holy Scriptures concerning the Meſſiah; or the types of him therein exhibited: which are all fulfilled, even to an iota, in our bleſſed Lord and Saviour.

Yet you reject him, as not being ſufficiently revealed in Scripture: while you think you can deduce from thence this beaſtly and unworthy legend of Armillus!

You

You have been told before of the ſtrange uncertainty you are at in the marks you have ſet up, whereby to know your Meſſiah, when he comes, which you have reduced all to ſucceſs; which cannot be known till the trial: and that has ended in your deſtruction, all the way hitherto, in the many experiments you have made under your ſeveral falſe Meſſiahs. And you can never be ſure, in any other who ſhall hereafter ſet up.

Nay further, you muſt be ſure to be ruined by whomſoever ſhall firſt ſet up, by this ſcheme which you have laid down: for your Meſſiah Ben Joſeph muſt firſt come and be ſlain, and your armies routed by Armillus. So that it is not ſucceſs, but ruin, that muſt be the mark of your firſt Meſſiah. This is great encouragement for any of you to follow whomſoever ſhall ſet up next for your Meſſiah!

You have had many ſuch Meſſiahs already. And whenever Ben Joſeph ſhall come, he muſt be another unfortunate Meſſiah. You muſt, by your own reckoning, be once more undone, before your Meſſiah Ben David can come. And when your Meſſiah Ben Joſeph ſhall come, and be defeated, how will you know, by that mark, that it is he? That mark you have had in all the Meſſiahs you ever yet ſet up. So that you will be ſtill left to expect a further deſtruction. Thus deplorable is your ſtate!

Beſides, which of theſe Meſſiahs, is it Ben Joſeph, or Ben David, to whom all thoſe marks given of the Meſſiah in the Scriptures do belong, as to the time, place, and other circumſtances of his coming? Or do ſome belong to one, and ſome to the other? Then you muſt tell which belong to which, or elſe you may be deceived in both: at leaſt, you can be ſure of neither.

XV. Neither of them can poſſibly now have that mark inſiſted upon before, of the general expectation of the whole earth, not only of the Roman empire, but of all the eaſt, that a wonderful and extraordinary perſon ſhould be ſent into the world, about that time, who ſhould be univerſal monarch of all the kings of the earth. And accordingly three kings came out of the eaſt to worſhip our Jeſus, guided

guided by the miraculous leading of a new ſtar raiſed in heaven to point him out.

But there is no ſuch expectation now in the world, but only amongſt you. Therefore none of your Meſſiahs can come with that mark, which ſeems even neceſſary, to introduce ſuch a Saviour into the world.

For to ſuppoſe ſuch a perſon deſigned by God, from all eternity, to be Univerſal Lord and Saviour of the whole earth: and that all the diſpenſations which God ever gave to man, were directed to him, as the center, and completion of all; it would ſeem neceſſary and proportionable to ſuch an œconomy, that ſo glorious a perſon ſhould be not only foretold, but prefigured in types and obſervances: nay it could not be otherwiſe, if all the inſtitutions of religion were to be compleated in him; for that would naturally infer that they were, that they could be no more than types and fore-runners of him to whom they pointed.

Thus Chriſt is ſaid to have been promiſed (*g*) πρὸ χρόνων αἰωνίων, which words if they ſhould not reach the length of our Engliſh tranſlation, *viz.* "before the world began," by which the revelation of the Great Meſſiah muſt have been made to the angels in heaven, before the creation of man, or of this lower world.

Yet this we are ſure of, that Moſes has told us (*h*) he was promiſed to Adam and Eve, immediately upon their fall. Then were ſacrifices inſtituted, as types of the great and only ſacrifice which could bruiſe the ſerpent's head, and make atonement for ſin: which by that promiſe, was reſerved for the ſeed of the woman; and therefore could not be fulfilled in the blood of beaſts.

This inſtitution of ſacrifices deſcended from that time, through all the poſterities of Adam, as a neceſſary part of religion, and the worſhip of God. And even the heathen retained ſo much of their original inſtitution, that they looked upon them in the nature of a vicarious ſuffering of others for our ſin: and the wiſeſt of them did thence con-

(*g*) Tit. i. 2. (*h*) Gen. iii. 15.

clude,

clude, that there muſt be ſome more noble ſacrifice than that of beaſts, whereby our ſin ſhould be purged. This led ſome of them to human ſacrifices: but ſtill that was not blood more noble than our own. And they could go no further.

Yet they were in expectation of the coming of a glorious perſon from heaven, who ſhould purge their ſins; and introduce a new and golden age of juſtice and all goodneſs, to extend through the whole earth: and they generally all over the world did expect him then to come at that time when our bleſſed Jeſus was born, as before has been ſhewn.

But that expectation is now over. There never was ſuch at any time, either before or after that very time. The expectation was always, long before that time: but no time except that time, was the time expected for his coming. Therefore none of your Meſſiahs, whom you ſtill expect, can poſſibly enter the world with this neceſſary and glorious mark of the Meſſiah. For that time being over, to which the general expectation was determined, it ceaſed there, and cannot now be taken up again; becauſe, as it could not be begun by concert, through ſo many diſtant nations, who held no correſpondence; and its beginning was never known: ſo for the ſame reaſons, it cannot now be begun again; for then the beginning would be known; and it could not, without a miracle, gain ſuch acceptance as to become univerſal through the whole world, as it was before.

And without this, it could not be ſaid, (*i*) "the deſire of "all nations ſhall come." For how was he their deſire, if they expected no ſuch perſon to come?

But as neither of the Meſſiahs whom you pretend to look for, are expected by any body but yourſelves; and that not by all, if any of you, (as we have reaſon to believe) in good earneſt; ſo, if they were expected according to the ſcheme that you have drawn, the firſt would be the contempt, and the ſecond the terror, but neither of them the deſire of all nations.

And neither of theſe motives either of terror or contempt could perſuade the Gentiles towards the fulfilling of what is

(*i*) Hag. ii. 7.

written

written concerning the Meſſiah. "The Gentiles ſhall "come to the light, and kings to the brightneſs of thy "riſing (*k*)."

This began remarkably to be fulfilled in the coming of the three kings from the eaſt, to the light, whether literal, of the miraculous ſtar, or, what that ſignified, the light of the Goſpel. And theſe came to the Meſſiah, not, as you expect, after being reduced by force of arms, and converted by his ſucceſs in war, but they came "to the brightneſs of "his riſing," to his birth; and (*l*) adored him in his ſwadling-cloaths. They rejoiced "with exceeding great joy," when they ſaw his ſignal hung out in the heavens. This joy could not come from contempt or fear. But he was truly the deſire of all nations; which neither of your Meſſiahs can be, by your own account of them.

He was not to come as a terror, but a light to the Gentiles; as he has proved, not by conquering, but converting of them.

And towards this, it was neceſſary that he ſhould come under all thoſe circumſtances which were proper for the obtaining of ſuch an end. To perſuade the Gentiles to receive him, as a Legiſlator ſent from heaven, for ſpiritual and eternal purpoſes; and not with any deſign upon their temporal government, or for any ſecular by-ends of his own.

Therefore he ought not to have come in the outward pomp and grandeur of the world; but the fartheſt removed from it that was poſſible: of mean, but virtuous parentage, his life to be led in poverty and afflictions, and his death, ignominious. He muſt have come in a corrupt and wicked age, to oppoſe iniquity in its torrent. And hence it naturally follows, that he muſt be perſecuted, even to the death. And that his death could not be deferred long, after his beginning to preach publicly; for that a wicked world could not long bear it. Which was the reaſon Socrates * gave at his trial, why he taught privately ſo long; for that other-

(*k*) Iſaiah lx. 3. (*l*) Matt. ii. 10. * Plato Apol. Socr.

wiſe

wiſe he muſt have periſhed ſooner: and ſo have been able to do leſs good.

And we may reaſonably ſuppoſe that this was one cauſe why our bleſſed Saviour (*m*) did not begin to preach, till he was thirty years of age. And about three years after was crucified.

Plato * deſcribing the character of a perfect juſt man, ſays, that he ſhall be ſcourged, tormented, fettered, and at laſt having ſuffered all manner of evils, that he ſhall be crucified, or cut in pieces, as the ſacrifices were.

And ſays, † that it is neceſſary they ſhould wait, till ſuch a one ſhould come, to teach them how they ought to behave themſelves towards God and towards man. "O when ſhall that time come? (ſays he) And who ſhall be that teacher? How greatly do I deſire to ſee that man, who he is?"

And he ſays, ‡ that this Lawgiver muſt be ſomewhat more than of human race; for that as beaſts are governed by men, ſo muſt men, by a nature which is ſuperior to their own: and therefore, that this man who was to be the Univerſal Lawgiver to mankind, muſt likewiſe partake of the nature of God. This was the ground of the heathen notion, in feigning their heroes and demons to be begotten by the gods. So agreeable (but far exceeding) was our Jeſus in his nature and all his qualifications, to the notion and expectation of the Gentiles! And therefore have ſo many of them gladly ſubmitted unto him.

But ſuch a Meſſiah as you Jews do now deſcribe yours to be, as it was far from what the Gentiles expected; and therefore he could never convert, though he ſhould conquer

(*m*) Matt. iv. 17. Luke iii. 23.

* Ὁ δίκαιος, μαστιγώσεται, στρεβλώσεται —— Τελευτῶν, πάντα κακὰ παθὼν, ἀνασκολοπισθήσεται. De Republ. l. 2.

† Ἀναίσχυντον ἂν εἴη περιμένειν ἕως ἄν τις μάθῃ ὡς δεῖ πρὸς Θεὸς καὶ πρὸς Ἀνθρώπους διακεῖσθαι. Πότε οὖν παρέσται ὁ χρόνος· ὅστις; Καὶ τίς ὁ παιδεύσων; ἥδιστα γὰρ ἂν μοι δοκῶ ἰδεῖν τοῦτον τὸν ἄνθρωπον τίς ἐστιν. Alcibiad. II. de Precat.

‡ De Leg. l. 4.

them:

them: ſo it ſeems not indeed, that yourſelves do expect any ſuch an one, as you pretend, only for an excuſe.

Some of your rabbies ſaying, that he is come; ſome, that he will never come; ſome, that he will not come in this world, till the reſurrection of the dead; others, that his coming is not material, nor to be placed amongſt the fundamentals of your faith; others, that his coming is no way deſirable, as bringing greater miſchief with it, than advantage to the Jews; others, forbidding all inquiry into the time of his coming, as indeed deſpairing of it.

Of all theſe particulars ſee the authorities of your own rabbies, in Hornbeck contra Jud. l. 2. p. 114, 115, and 123. There you will find, in Codice Sanhedrin, R. Hillel ſaying, That no Meſſiah ſhall be given to Iſrael, for that they have had him already, in the days of Hezekiah king of Judah. And in your Talmud, R. Ula ſays of the Meſſiah, "let him come, but let me not ſee it:" that is, for the miſeries it will bring to the Jews, in gathering them out of all countries, where they are peaceably ſettled, to forſake their houſes and poſſeſſions; and follow their Meſſiah to wars, and the calamities that attend it. Eſpecially conſidering what has been before ſaid, that they muſt certainly expect deſtruction and ruin, under their firſt Meſſiah Ben Joſeph. For all which, their poſſeſſing, at laſt, the Land of Canaan, will be no ſufficient reparation; they living now in countries as good as that, and enjoying both eaſe and plenty: that the conqueſts of their Meſſiah may bring greater glory to him; but no good to the Jews, proportionable to the miſeries they muſt endure in fighting for him. Upon all which conſiderations, R. Ula had reaſon to ſay, "Let him come, but let not me ſee him." The ſame ſaid Rabba, and Rabbi John, in Codice Sanhedrin.

And the many diſappointments you have met with in your Meſſiahs hitherto, has made you forbid any to inquire into the time of the Meſſiah's coming; your Schebet Jehuda, p. 245, (as quoted by Hornbeck, p. 123.) curſes thoſe who ſet any time for the coming of the Meſſiah; and gives this reaſon, That if the Meſſiah does not come at that time, the

the people's hearts do fail; and they think that they are put off with perpetual fruitleſs hope. Therefore in the Talmud. Cod. Sanhedrin, cap. xi. Rabbi Samuel ſays, in the words of Rabbi Jonathan, "Let their bones be broken, who compute the periods of the times." And this may the better be forbid, becauſe R. Joſephus Albo has ſtruck this article concerning the coming of the Meſſiah out of the number of your fundamental doctrines. So that now you may believe it, or not, as you pleaſe.

And how then will the Gentiles be converted by you? You have confeſſed (as before ſhewn,) that you have no arguments againſt them; and now you ſeem to deſpair, even of conquering them. Though if that were done, it would rather obſtruct their converſion, as has been urged before.

And plain reaſon does evince, that the qualifications of a Meſſiah for the converſion of the Gentiles, could be no other than what were found in our Jeſus; and ſuch a one they did expect; and therefore ſo readily did give up their names to him.

As his miracles were ſo flagrant and undoubted, as to vouch him ſent of God; ſo could not malice itſelf find out the leaſt poſſibility of any ſiniſter or ſelf-end in him. Therefore he lived poor, and perſecuted, and poured out his ſoul unto death, as a demonſtration, that his kingdom was not of this world.

He choſe followers that were poor, and unlearned: and this was neceſſary to obviate the objection, that either intereſt or craft had any part in the framing of his doctrine. He enjoined to all his diſciples the doctrine of ſelf-denial, and the croſs; and bade them look for nothing but afflictions in this world: and this was neceſſary, to obviate the objection, as if either luſt, pleaſure, or ambition, had any part in the framing of his doctrine. He was rejected by you, of his own nation; and this was neceſſary, to obviate the objection, as if he ſought to gain you on his ſide, upon the account of obtaining the dominion over you; and then to turn your arms againſt the Gentiles.

His conqueſt of the Gentiles, by their converſion, did not begin, till after his aſcenſion: and this was neceſſary, to obviate the objection, as if he had ſought the temporal rule over them; as Mahomet did over his converts; and as you propoſe of your Meſſiah.

And not in the firſt converſion of the Gentiles, nor for three hundred years after, were any of their kings or ſtates brought in to Chriſtianity; and this was neceſſary, to obviate the objection, as if the forgery of the Goſpel had been ſupported by human authority; which rendered it hazardous for any to have detected the deceit. This was ſo neceſſary, as that we ſee the Deiſts, for want of this, have yet the impudence to ſuppoſe it, contrary to all truth, *viz.* that * authority and laws being on the Chriſtian ſide, was the cauſe that its deceit was not detected, at the beginning; which is now too late to be done, for the diſtance of the ages.

Therefore, we may now ſee the wonderful providence of God, in this conduct; for if the Deiſts had the argument (as they fooliſhly pretend it) of the Goſpel being abetted by kings or ſtates, in its infancy; or before it was fully ſettled, and ſpread over the earth; we ſhould never get their mouths ſtopped, and it would bear a great face of ſuſpicion, that ſome cheat might have been put upon us, when none who knew it, durſt diſcover it, without apparent hazard to themſelves.

And again, kings and ſtates might have come, by this time of day, to think that their authority had ſomething to do in ſettling of the church; and that the Goſpel was beholding to them; at leaſt ſycophants and flatterers would ſo have complimented them; and Eraſtianiſm would have had a plauſible plea. It is a branch of Deiſm. It ſtands and falls with that. And if it had ſuch an umbrage as this, it would over-run us; for it keeps its ground without it.

But Chriſt would not permit kings to become his ſervants, till he had firſt endured three hundred years of their perſe-

* Toland's Life of Milton, p. 91, 92. Printed anno 1699.

cution,

cution; to teach them that his church was not built upon their ſhoulders, nor depended upon their authority: and to ſtop the mouths of theſe ſeveral ſorts of Deiſts.

In all things, in every ſtep of his conduct, there does appear ſuch divine wiſdom and foreſight, as that if any part had been otherwiſe than it is, the whole would have been viſibly defective; and conſequently not from God. Not that many things defective may not be from God. He makes every thing perfect, in its kind; to the end for which he has ordained it: but he makes ſome things for higher ends than others; and in compariſon, one thing is more perfect than another.

Thus the law of Moſes was perfect in its kind, for thoſe ends and purpoſes to which it was deſigned: but Moſes was not deſigned for the ultimate and univerſal lawgiver: he never pretended to it; but, on the contrary, he pointed out (*n*) to one who was to come after him; and denounces God's judgments againſt thoſe who ſhould not hearken unto him.

Moſes was not deſigned, nor his law calculated for the converſion of the Gentiles.

And he had few of thoſe qualifications which the Gentiles required in the Supreme and Univerſal law-giver. He was bred up at Pharaoh's court; the adopted ſon of Pharaoh's daughter; and learned in all the wiſdom of the Egyptians, who were then the moſt learned nation upon the face of the earth: he was mighty in words and in deeds. He marched out of Egypt, at the head of 600,000 men: (*o*) and having reſcued his own nation, he became their king. Therefore he was not free from the ſuſpicion of deſign in the caſe; and was a man every way qualified, both for wiſdom, courage, and education, to have contrived and effected it.

And after him, his diſciples went on according to his example, conquering with the ſword. And you now tell us, that they had no other deſign, but to gain that pleaſant country to themſelves: that the law which Moſes gave them,

(*n*) Deut. xviii. 18, 19. (*o*) Ibid. xxxiii. 5.

propoſed nothing to them beyond this: and that you hope for no more from the Meſſiah whom you expect, but temporal conqueſts, to reſtore you to that land again; and to ſubdue the whole world under you, by force of arms. That there is nothing at all ſpiritual or heavenly in his kingdom; but only a temporal earthly grandeur. That it was not meant to carry you to heaven, but to make you great upon earth. That the offices of the Meſſiah reſpect only temporal things; and are no ways neceſſary towards the ſalvation of our ſouls, or eternal life, as your learned Jew *, before quoted, has aſſerted.

Now what would Socrates, or Plato, or any of the wiſe men among the Gentiles ſay to this notion of a Meſſiah? Would they not have deteſted it, as vicious, as recommending of pride, ambition, covetouſneſs, and the vanity of this world; againſt which they fought, and thought them unworthy of a philoſopher, or a truly virtuous perſon? Therefore ſuch a Meſſiah could never have converted them.

But on the other hand, there is not any one circumſtance or qualification which they could deſire in a Meſſiah which is not filled up, nay far exceeded, in their own way, beyond what they could have contrived, as to the ſtricteſt rules of virtue, in the perſon, life, and death of our Meſſiah, and in all his conduct: ſhewing, beyond the poſſibility of a deceit, or a face of ſuſpicion, that he was a Legiſlator ſent from heaven, without any temporal deſigns; Firſt, To give the ſanction of God to morality; which, though theſe philoſophers taught truly, yet could they not ſtamp upon it ſuch a ſeal of divine authority: and Secondly, To carry them further, and teach them the true worſhip of God; and expiation of their ſins; with the aſſurance of everlaſting life; and the means of obtaining it. All which they confeſſed they wanted; and that they did expect ſuch a Meſſiah, or a perſon anointed, a Chriſt, that is, delegated and authorized by God, to be born into the world, who ſhould teach this Goſpel or glad-tidings unto them. And he came

* Limbor. Collat. n. iv. p. 53. and n. xiv. p. 66.

with

with ſuch demonſtration of his commiſſion, and divinely wiſe conduct in all his adminiſtration, that a Socrates, a Pythagoras, or a Plato, could not only have found no objection, but muſt have admired and adored, as ſo far exceeding whatever they imperfectly had conjectured, though they were aſſiſted with the greateſt wiſdom and virtue that was in all the Gentile world.

Thus you ſee that the objections which you Jews, and ſome of the lewd and fooliſh Deiſts, have made againſt the poverty, ſufferings, and death of our Meſſiah, turn all into demonſtrations of his truth; and were ſo neceſſary, that, as he could not have fulfilled the Law without them, ſo could he never any otherwiſe have been received of the Gentiles.

For God forces not, though he governs the wills of men. That would be to deſtroy the creature he had made: for without the freedom of will, man would not be a reaſonable animal; and the wiſdom of God is chiefly known, in ſo diſpoſing of things, as to bring his own purpoſes to paſs, and yet leaving men to the full freedom of their own wills.

This was one reaſon why our Jeſus would not ſuffer the devils to confeſs him; and charged ſeveral whom he cured, not to make it known till the time ſhould come that he was to ſuffer: for that would have haſtened his ſufferings before the time, for the reaſon before given out of Socrates's defence.

It was in his power to have forced the Jews to a confeſſion of him, but then they had not acted freely. Therefore having given them all reaſonable conviction of his miſſion, he left them to their freedom, whether they would acknowledge him or not: and their obſtinacy did harden them ſtill more, and depraved their judgment, which was a juſt puniſhment of their obſtinacy, as well as a natural effect of it. For ſin does always puniſh itſelf; it is its own accuſer, judge, and executioner. This blinded the obſtinate among the Jews, that they knew not their Meſſiah; for had they known him, they would not have crucified the Lord of glory. And thus that wonderful œconomy for the ſalvation

of man was brought about, by the greateſt conduct of wiſdom and goodneſs that was poſſible.

And by the ſame means the converſion of the Gentiles was contrived; for had the Jews all generally followed Chriſt, the Gentiles, being left to their own freedom, would never have received him, becauſe they would have looked upon him as a legiſlator ſent only to the Jews, whoſe Law kept them at the utmoſt diſtance and deteſtation of the Gentiles: (*p*) whom therefore the Gentiles hated and deſpiſed, and thought it abomination ſo much as to eat with them, and therefore would have diſdained to have received a law-giver from them, who pretended to a right and a promiſe to conquer and overcome all the whole Gentile world, and ſubdue them under their Meſſiah, which they underſtood was to be by force of arms. And though ſuch Meſſiah had ſet up with never ſo much guiſe of humility and meekneſs, and put out the moſt ſpecious declarations, (as other conquerors have at firſt done) if he had led the whole body of the Jews after him, the Gentiles would have looked upon all this as a trick to diſarm them, by rendering them ſecure, and would not have ſo been caught.

On the other hand, the Jews could never have received a Meſſiah from the Gentiles: that was contrary to all the promiſes made to them in their Law.

Therefore as it was neceſſary, with reſpect to the ſegullah, that the Meſſiah ſhould be of the Jews, ſo was it neceſſary, in reſpect of the Gentiles, that he ſhould be rejected by the chief of the Jews: that he ſhould be perſecuted and deſtroyed by them. He could not otherwiſe have become an univerſal law-giver both to the Jews and the Gentiles.

And let me ſay, in reſpect of the Deiſts, it was neceſſary that there ſhould be a ſegullah, or peculiar church of God ſet up ſomewhere, in ſome one nation of the world, elſe the whole earth would have been irrecoverably ſunk in idolatry: and there could never, in ſuch a frame of things, be any expiation for the ſins of mankind, who therefore were

(*p*) Gen. xliii. 32.

all

all repreſented in the nation of the ſegullah, and to be, by degrees, incorporated into them, and converted by them.

And it was likewiſe neceſſary that this nation of the ſegullah ſhould be the feweſt and moſt neglected people of the earth.

And it was neceſſary that the Meſſiah ſhould have been rejected by the chief and governing part of the Jews, the chief prieſts and ſanhedrim: ſo was it as neceſſary that he ſhould have been received and followed by others of the meaneſt and leſs noticed of the Jews, becauſe the Gentiles were to be converted by the Jews, and brought into their ſegullah.

And theſe Jews who at firſt followed Chriſt, were to be but few and inconſiderable during his life: to take away all umbrage from the Gentiles as well as the governing part of the Jews, that he deſigned any infraction upon their civil rights and liberties.

Therefore the great flowing in of the Jews firſt, particularly of their prieſts, (*q*) and afterwards of the Gentiles, was not till after the aſcenſion of our bleſſed Lord, to put them out of all fear of his going about to ſet up a temporal kingdom after his reſurrection, (as his diſciples expected, Acts i. 6.) For that had made a great noiſe, and given the alarm both to the high-prieſt and governors of the Jews, as well as to the Gentiles: therefore, though he ſhewed himſelf openly, after his reſurrection, and to ſo many, and at ſundry times, and by ſuch infallible proofs, as to confirm the truth of it paſt all poſſibility of a deceit, or ground of ſcruple to after ages, yet he ſhewed not himſelf (*r*) "openly to all the people." That would have ſet the whole world in a flame all on the ſudden, who were not prepared, for they knew not as yet the deſign of his kingdom, that it was to be ſpiritual and heavenly, till he ſhould in a long tract of time, and by degrees, bring over the whole kingdom of the earth to his ſubjection, in the belief of his Goſpel; not by force of arms, (for that

(*q*) Acts vi. 7. (*r*) Acts x. 40, 41.

could not have done it) but according to the full freedom of their own wills by a rational conviction.

And it is obſervable, that though one great article of the apoſtolical office (s) at firſt, was particularly to be witneſſes of the reſurrection of Chriſt; that this, at firſt, was neceſſary to the conſtitution of an Apoſtle, and therefore Chriſt did ſhew himſelf, in a miraculous manner, to St. Paul, to qualify him for that office; yet, as himſelf ſays, it was "laſt "of all, as one born out of due time." For he was conſtituted to be the Apoſtle of the Gentiles, who came in to the Goſpel laſt of all, as born out of due time.

And he was the only man among the Apoſtles who had acquired learning by ſtudy and education; therefore he was not admitted till the Goſpel had been firſt preached by the others, and fully eſtabliſhed; and he was, at firſt, a perſecuter of it, to take away the leaſt ſuſpicion that his parts or learning had any ſhare in the contrivance of the Goſpel. And then his coming in at laſt, did remove the prejudice that no men of learning and ſagacity had embraced it. He broke the ice for the Gentiles, who were admirers of learning, and for this they valued him the more, and hearkened to him.

I could enlarge in many other particulars, indeed in every particular, through the whole œconomy of the Goſpel, to ſhew the wonderful conduct, and moſt minute proportion that there is in every part; which, of itſelf, were ſufficient to convince any conſidering perſon that the whole contrivance was divine, and that no leſſer wiſdom could have ſo diſpoſed of it.

But that would require a treatiſe by itſelf: and thus much I thought neceſſary for my preſent ſubject, to ſhew how we Gentiles were drawn into the belief of the Goſpel by the cords of a man, by ſuch methods as overcame our reaſon, without deſtroying the freedom of our will. Such as give us the utmoſt demonſtration of the wiſdom and goodneſs of God without the interpoſition of his almighty power, by which he governs the unthinking part of his creation.

(s) Acts i. 22.

And

And as the Jews firſt brought us into the Goſpel, ſo would we now provoke them to emulation by the ſame methods in which God has dealt with us; by ſhewing them the beauty, the harmony, and irrefragable demonſtration of fact that has convinced us of the truth of the Goſpel.

The infidelity of ſo many of you Jews was neceſſary towards our receiving of the Goſpel, till the fulneſs of the Gentiles ſhould come in.

(*t*) And if the caſting away of you be the reconciling of the world, what ſhall the reconciling of you be, but life from the dead! Amen.

XVI. Let me now conclude, and apply all that has been ſaid, by a ſhort recapitulation and enforcement of the principal parts of it.

You have given up all the credibility that there is for the truth of Moſes and your Law, rather than admit of the ſame credibility (and ſtronger) that there is for Chriſt and the Goſpel. So that, as was ſaid before, and has been proved, you have involved yourſelves under the neceſſity either of rejecting Moſes, or embracing of Chriſtianity.

Your objections have been anſwered *ex abundanti*; for after the full proof of the miracles of Chriſt and his Apoſtles, there needed no more to have been ſaid, as to receiving the doctrine which they taught, and thoſe expoſitions they gave of the Law, which ſtand upon as ſure a foundation, and carry the ſame infallible credentials of divine authority as the Law itſelf.

And theſe cannot be overthrown by ever ſo great a cloud of difficulties or objections, though they could not be anſwered to ſatisfaction, without diſproving the motives of credibility upon which they are received.

For we may have ſufficient reaſon to believe many things, and yet not be able to ſolve all the difficulties that may ariſe concerning them.

As in natural things, we cannot explain the manner and conveyance of ſenſible objects through our outward organs

(*t*) Rom. xi. 15.

to our ſoul, nor the thouſandth part of thoſe difficulties which are ſtarted concerning the ſoul itſelf, yet no man doubts but that he has a ſoul, that he ſees, hears, thinks, reaſons, &c.

So in ſupernatural things, who can ſolve all that may be aſked concerning the being and operations of God? Yet all this is no argument againſt the belief of a firſt cauſe, and its eſſential perfections, becauſe it is forced upon us by undeniable reaſon.

Therefore, unleſs you can ſhew the fallacy of thoſe four marks which in the firſt part are ſet down to aſcertain the truth of matters of fact; or, ſecondly, ſhew that the matters of fact of Chriſt want any of them, all your objections borrowed from other topics, can ſignify nothing againſt the truth of Chriſtianity.

And if you can ſhew the uncertainty of theſe marks, or that they are wanting to the evidence of Chriſtianity, then down comes your Law with it, and we muſt all together turn Deiſts.

You ſay (as has been before quoted) that if Chriſt, after he roſe from the dead, had appeared to the whole congregation of Iſrael, &c. that this would have removed all ſcruple from you, and that you would, without all doubt, have believed him.

And now, I beſeech you, have you not had as miraculous confirmation of him, as even this which you require? Was not the viſible deſcent of the Holy Ghoſt upon him at his baptiſm, and the audible voice from heaven, before all the people, telling them from the mouth of God, "This is my "beloved Son, &c." was not this a much ſtronger indication from God, than if a man formerly dead, had appeared? Might not one man be like another? Have not many been deceived upon that point? Were not the Apoſtles hardly brought to believe it, even by many miracles? Would there not be more queſtions to be aſked in that caſe, than in ſuch a viſible apparition from heaven, before the eyes of ſo many people, and of words ſpoke from heaven in all their hearing?

Our

Our bleſſed Saviour ſaid to ſome of your fathers, (*u*) that "if they heard not Moſes and the prophets, neither would "they be perſuaded, though one roſe from the dead." And the reaſon is plain, becauſe the proofs for Moſes, &c. are more indubitable than the apparition of the dead man.

But do you want even this proof? Did not Chriſt appear, after his reſurrection, to above five hundred of your fathers at once? And has not this been atteſted by a multitude of miracles wrought by thoſe of your fathers, who ſaw him, who eat with him, and converſed forty days with him, after he roſe from the dead? Did he not appear to Paul from heaven after his aſcenſion? If not, would not ſome of thoſe Jews who then journied with him, who ſaw that light, above the brightneſs of the ſun, and heard the voice, though not the diſtinct words of him that ſpoke to Paul, who were ſtruck down to the earth, and greatly terrified, who ſaw Paul ſtruck blind upon the ſpot, and led him by the hand into Damaſcus: would none of theſe have diſcovered the cheat, if all this ſtory had been a mere invention and forgery of Paul's? Would none of theſe have done it, who were ſo far from being favourable to the Chriſtian ſide, that they were then going along with Paul to perſecute that way, even unto the death? Would they not have done it, when Paul trumpt it up, and the Chriſtians laid ſuch ſtreſs upon it, that it is told at large in three ſeveral places of the Acts, chap. ix. xxii. and xxvi.? When Paul, within three days, began to preach Chriſt in Damaſcus, and confounded the Jews there, where thoſe who journied with him were then preſent, and might have confounded him, if they had denied that matter of fact, when he adduced them as witneſſes of it. But above all, the miracles which Paul wrought, as great even as this, do vouch his truth in this matter; ſeeing they are deduced to us with all the four marks before-mentioned, which do infallibly demonſtrate the certainty of any matter of fact.

(*u*) Luke xvi. 31.

Moreover

Moreover conſider, that all theſe witneſſes to the reſurrection of Chriſt were Jews, and none other. It has been before obſerved that Chriſt preached to none but the Jews before his death; ſo after his reſurrection he ſhewed himſelf to none other but to them. And from the Jews only have we Gentiles received the knowledge of his reſurrection, and of all the Goſpel. This is a tradition of the Jews, and deduced through a greater number of them and their poſterities, (as before has been ſhewn) than there are Jews who now ſtand out againſt it. Theſe reject the tradition of their fathers, upon which they now lay the whole ſtreſs of their religion, and are proof againſt thoſe convictions which have converted the Gentiles. The Chriſtian Jews did not ſet up Chriſt for their Meſſiah; (*x*) they choſe not him, but he choſe them. They knew him not to be the Meſſiah, till they were convinced by many miracles; they underſtood not the nature of his kingdom, but were brought by him from their notion of reigning, to that of ſuffering with him upon the earth. Therefore theſe are to be leſs ſuſpected than thoſe others of your fathers who ſet up Meſſiahs for themſelves, in hopes to reign with them in the land of Canaan, and have been as often deceived, and ſuffered miſerable deſtruction by it.

But as before has been argued, there is no ſuch viſible means in the world to bring them to that temporal grandeur which they expect, and the nation of the Jews to that univerſal honour, ſuper-eminence, and dominion through the whole earth, as their converſion to Chriſtianity. Then will Chriſt be not only a light to the Gentiles, but the glory of his people Iſrael.

But chiefly, and above all, I earneſtly recommend to you Jews the conſideration of your eternal ſtate, towards which you expect no benefit from your Meſſiah, and yet without whom you can give no account how you ſhall be delivered and purged from thoſe ſins for which there were no ſacrifices or expiation under the Law, as has been diſcourſed before.

(*x*) John xv. 16.

There

There was none for thoſe who fled to the cities of refuge. (*y*) Nothing could deliver them from thence, but the death of the high-prieſt; which was a plain type that nothing but the death of our great high-prieſt can deliver us from the guilt of ſin. The like parallel might be carried on through every branch of your Law, pointing to the Meſſiah, but that would divert too much. You have only a few inſtances here; the whole would take up a diſcourſe longer than all I have written to you.

I wiſh even the temporal glory of Iſrael, and ſhould rejoice that, in the day of their converſion, I ſhould be found among thoſe who are ſprung from their ſtock, and ſhall exult to re-aſſume our ancient and moſt honourable name of Jews.

And let the chiefeſt glory, as in heaven, ſo on earth be to thoſe of you who ſhall lead the way, and be inſtrumental in the reſtoration of the families of Jacob.

Towards which I will with theſe my ſmall endeavours, join my hearty prayers, made more effectual as offered up in the communion of the holy Catholic church, that part of it eſpecially in England which prays for you, on this bleſſed day, to your God, and our God, through the mediation and ſatisfaction made for us by your and our only Meſſiah; and after his holy example, who, this day, poured forth his blood, with his prayers for you upon the croſs. O Lord, that this were the time when they ſhould be heard! Amen. Lord Jeſus, come quickly.

(*y*) Num. xxxv. 25, 28.

GOOD-FRIDAY,
1689.

FINIS.


G.R.
III